rules of the House. Something else is on the agenda.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: You all know the rules but ... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): How can you raise the point of order at this point of time? We have the otner Business.

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: *

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Again he is making the allegation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Nothing is going on record.

DR RATNAKAR PANDEY: *

THE MINITER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA): The Special Mention had been made with the permission of the Chair. If there is anything unparliamentary, it is for you to look into it. How could it have been prevented when permission had been given?

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Sir, kindly look into the record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I cannot allow it at this point of time. This is my ruling. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.M. JACOB: There is no Special Mention before the House now. It is only the Thakkar Commission's Report.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: *

* Not recorded.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no, I cannot allow this now. I will not allow anybody. I cannot allow you. I am on my legs now. The business before the House now is the Motion of the Home Minister and as such I cannot allow anything else. Yes, Mr. Home Minister.

MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION OF THAKKAR COMMISION REPORT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the Interim Report and the Final Report along with appendices of the Thakkar Commission on the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the late Prime Minister, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 27th March, 1989, be taken into consideration."

Sir, reports of the Thakkar Commission of Inquiry set up for the purpose of making an inquiry into the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi were laid on the Table of the House on the 27th of March, 1989. The reports comprised an Interim Report and a Final Report. On behalf of the Government we had requested for a discussion in the House on the report. I am grateful that the House has agreed to take up the report for discussion.

The subject matter of the Thakkar Commission of Inquiry is of great public interest and importance. The assassination of the Prime Minister of a country is a traumatic experience for the people of the country. For us, the people of India, who loved Shrimati Indira Gandhi so dearly, the death of Shrimati Indira Gandhi came as a great shock. In fact, there

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

were many who wondered if this country would hold together after the death of Indiraji. We know that there are forces in the world which do not appreciate the emergence of India as a free country, a strong nation and a prosperous people. In the last 42 years we have made giant strides. There is indeed poverty, but we have also achieved remarkable progress. There is illiteracy but millions of our people are literate and several thousands have won high laurels in many fields, including science and technology. We know that there are forces within the country which will not hesitate to join hands with forces outside the country to destabilise our political system, to weaken our economy and to shatter the polity which we are building brick by brick, slowly, but surely. Sir, I do not wish to dwell at great length on the threats to our stability as a nation. We have faced wars, we have faced internal disturbance, but through all this we have emerged stronger.

Sir, I recall this background so that hon. Members will keep in their view and in their perspective the circumstances under which the Thakkar Commission was established, and while discussing the contents of the report, not lose sight of the grave dangers that continue to threaten the unity and integrity of our country.

Sir, Indiraji was murdered on the 31st of October, 1984. One of the assassins was arrested on the same day. The investigation of the crime was taken up by the Crime Branch of the Delhi Police, but we felt that the crime was too horrendous, too important, to be left to the Police of the Union Territory. We, therefore, established a Special Investigation Team (SIT), headed by an officer of the rank of Director-General of Police. He was assisted by an extremely competent band of officers, hand-picked for their skill and experience in the matter of criminal investigation. The SIT took over the investigation from the Delhi Police on the 15th of November, 1984.

Sir, the immediate crime to be solved was the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Yet, the air was thick with rumour that there was, perhaps, a larger conspiracy behind the crime Under our laws, Sir, as you know, a chargesheet would have to be filed within 90 days. Accordingly, the SIT took up the investigation of the crime and, within the stipulated period, they were able to file a chargesheet against Satwant Singh, Beant singh, Kehar Singh and some others. It is a matter of satisfaction to us that the SIT has been able to bring the culprits to book. The trial court, the High Court and, finally, the Supreme Court, found three of the accused guilty. Beant Singh, of course, was dead on the day of the crime. The other two were sentenced to death.

In order that we unravel the mystery behind the crime and unravel the conspiracy, if there was any, and in order to identify the weaknesses and lapses in the system which led to the assassination of the Prime Minister by her own security guards, we also appointed a Commission of Inquiry headed by Justice Thakkar. Sir, here I wish to emphasize the point that after the decision was taken to constitute a Commission of Inquiry, the choice of the Judge to head the Commission was not taken by the Government. The choice was made in consultation with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India and his suggestion in this behalf was accepted and Justice Thakkar was appointed as the Commission of Inquiry.

Sir, Justice Thakkar devised his own rules of procedure for the conduct of the inquiry. Under law he was entitled to appoint any investigating agency or any other agency to assist him. The SIT was, in fact, engaged in the same exercise of gathering material and Justice Thakkar, I

believe, used much of that material. The point that I wish to emphasize is, the SIT was not a stranger to the material and information gathered and assembled by the Thakkar Commission of Inquiry.

Sir, the Thakkar Commission was given five terms of reference. Honourable Members are familiar with the terms of reference. Thery are reproduced in the report. The Thakkar Commission submitted its first report, captioned as "Interim Report", but I would like to describe it as the first report because it, in fact, disposes of three terms of reference . . .

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Finally.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: . . . finally. In fact, some of the semantic confusion arose because he described his first Report as "Interim Report" and many thought that it was interim in the sense that it did not conclude any matter. But Justice Thakkar himself explains, it is interim only in the sense that it is a part report, it is a partial report. He submitted this Report on the 19th of November, 1985. At the risk of repetition, Sir, I would like to say what I said this morning, nothing but this volume captioned "Interim Report" was submitted to the Home Minister on the 19th of November, 1985. The Final Report which is really the second Report, on item 1 and item 5 of the terms of reference, was submitted to the Home Minister on the 27th of February, 1986. Again, Sir, you will pardon my repetition, on the 27th February, 1986 nothing more was submitted to the Home Minister except this document captioned "Final Report".

Sir, in May, 1986 the President was pleased to promulgate an ordinance amending the Commissions of Inquiry Act. The ordinance was made on the 14th of May, 1986. On the 15th of May, 1986 a decision was taken to make a notification to keep the two Reports confidential and secret and not to place them on the Table of the House. It is a matter of considerable distress that the author of the law and the author of the notification, the authors of the enabling law and the notification, in their new "avatar" should now turn round and criticise the Government for taking those decisions in May, 1986. Hon. Members are well aware who I am referring to.

Sir, in a sense this decision to keep the two Reports confidential and secret has enabled both Justice Thakkar and the SIT, first for Justice Thakkar as the Interim Report was withheld so that he could make the Final Report, and then for the S.I.T., as both the Reports were withheld, to complete its work.

In fact, Sir, you will note that for a period of nearly two years and nine months there has been no whisper, no criticism, no controversy, no recrimination over the Thakkar Commission Enquiry Report. In fact, it is a misconception that a version of a chapter of the Report was first published on the 14th of March, 1989. It was, in fact, published on the 31st of March, 1986 in a fortnightly magazine, and a follow-up to that was published, if I remember right, on the 7th of July, 1986. Those who will complain, were occupying positions of authority and office, and I suppose they were weighed down by the responsbility of the office not to complain at that time. Today, two years and nine months later, we find misconceived criticism, misplaced criticism against the Government. But, I wish to take just a few minutes in my introductory remarks to place before this hon. House the facts which will show that Government has acted with great responsibility, great restraint and a great deal of circumspection.

Sir, Justice Thakkar, in his Interim Report, dealt with the security system. He made 21 recommendations. We have taken action on all those recommendations. Today, the security of the Prime Minister has been totally, completely re-

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

vamped, and it is in the hands of a highly professional, highly motivated, highly trained Special Protection Group. In fact, Sir, barring the incident of October 2, 1986, which again highlighted the fact that we had not learnt our lessons properly in the last two and a half years, despite the numerous engagements of the Prime Minister, despite the numerous visits he makes to the various States, despite the fact that he mingles with thousands of people, we have been able to give him the protection that any person holding that office deserves to be given, particularly in the secuity environment of India. The Prime Minister has been able to visit Punjab—a State where we face our greatest threats from terrorism. So, we have taken action on the 21 recommendations made by Justice Thakkar on the security system of the Prime Minister. But, Sir, we are never satisfied. Nobody can sit back and say I am satisfied with the security system. A security system is only so good as often as you find chinks in the security system. We are alert and we shall continue to be alert. I can only appeal to the people of this country, I can only apeal to those who live in this city, if from time to time you have to bear with some inconveniences while the security system has to work to secure the Prime Minister, please bear with those inconveniences. These inconveniences are a small price we have to pay Look at the enormous price we paid by losing the life of Indira Gandhi.

Justice Thakkar has also made several recommendations on the medical facilities that were available to the then Prime Minister immediately after the attack on her. We have looked into the matter with great care. We have involved very senior doctors and we have revamped the medical security system also. In case of emergency we think we have arranged a good system by which emergency medical care can be rushed to the Prime Minister in the event of the Prime Minister requiring such medical care.

But, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. House to the fact that best medical treatment was indeed provided to Indira Ji. Eminent doctors and independent doctors had deposed, and some of that is added to the report, that the best medical treatement was given to Shrimati Indira Gandhi. But she had suffered such grievous injuries, her body had been riddled with bullets, that no amount of medical care could save her.

The next portion of the report of Justice Thakkar has indicted twentyone officers.

I would like to divide these officers into two categories. One is a set of officers whose negligence is supported by evidence other than the contents of the report. We have material outside the report to show that these officers were negligent. For example, officers immediately charged with the security of the Prime Minister—the Deputy Commissioner of Police and the Additional Commissioner of Police. These were the officers who were given this task. And if the Prime Minister, whose security was entrusted to their care, was assassinated, it does not require a commission of inquiry to tell us that they were responsible. They were certainly responsible. There is a certain direct responsibility. There is also a certain constructive responsibility. Against such officers we took action immediately. We did not wait for the Commission's report. But there is also another category of officers whose negligence was established for the first time by the Commission. The Commission gathered the material and the Commission found them negligent or guilty of lapses. In respect of them, in the nature of things, because the Commission's report had been kept confidential, it was not possible to initiate action. Now that we have published the report, we have initiated action against those officers also.

Sir, the final report again falls in three parts. The Commission in its judgement has found a number of circumstances which point a finger of suspicion against an officer who occupied the position of Special Assistant to the late Prime Minister. But, Sir, while reading the Commission's report in this respect, one must also read the Commission's caveat. The Commission has entered a caveat that it did not hold an inquiry under section 8B of the Commissions of Inquiry Act. Sir, you are aware of the provisions of section 8B of the Commissions of Inquiry Act. Under section 8B, if at any stage of the inquiry the Commission (a) considers it necessary to enquire into the conduct of any person or (b) is of opinion that the reputation of any person is likely to be prejudicially affected by the inquiry, the Commission shall give to that person a reasonable opportunity of being heard in the inquiry and produce evidence in defence. The Commission itself has candidly stated that section 8B was not invoked and, therefore, the conclusions reached by the Commission are at best only tentative conclusions and cannot be taken as findings or final conclusions against the person referred to in that portion of the report.

I would also, Sir, invite your kind attention to the words used by the Commission itself. The Commission had called its exercise as an "exploratory exercise" In another place the Commission describes its work as a "pre-enquiry investigative exercise".

Sir, I do not wish to comment upon the procedure adopted by the Commission. Honourable Members, of course, will share their valued views with us, but the conclusions reached by the Commission are, therefore, only conclusions of an exploratory nature and conclusions at a pre-investigative stage, conclusions which are tentative and, therefore, one must read these conclusions in the context in which these conclusions have been arrived at. But in all fairness to the Commission, the Commission observed and recommended that an investigative agency should take up where the Commission has left off and should take up the investigation to its logical conclusions. The Commission has also referred to some subsidiary points involving the correspondent of the British Broadcasting Corporation, about the businessmen in whose possession certain blank letter heads were found, about the matter of terrorists training schools in some countries and finally that the final report may not be made public. Sir, in the 'action taken' report, we have dealt with all these aspects and I do not think I need take the time of this honourable House explaining those matters. Sir, after the Commission completed its labours and the SIT filed its charge-sheet in the crime of assassination against Satwant Singh, Beant Singh and Kehar Singh, the SIT conducted its investigation into the larger conspiracy. Sir, here I wish to point out that the time taken by the SIT may appear too long. The SIT has taken full 50 months to complete its labour, but just compare it with the fact that the murder of Olof Palme has not been solved so far, the killing of Lord Mountbatten has not been solved so far. The assissination of President Kennedy is still a riddle wrapped in mystery. Our SIT, our officers, have unravelled a very large conspiracy. I wish to take this House into confidence and share just some information because under the law, the SIT is required to file its report before a court under section 173, sub-section 2 of the Criminal Procedure Code, and it would be neither prudent nor fair on my part to reveal the details of the report the SIT will file very shortly. But, Sir, a large conspiracy has indeed been unearthed. The conspiracy involves certain key people. The conspiracy takes one from Bihar to Bombay to Nagpur to Indore to Bhopal and to Delhi. The conspiracy is more than a mere attempt to assassinate the Prime Minister. It involves several other criminal acts and it is a conspiracy which, I think, is so serious that this House and the people of

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

this country must give their most serious attention to the dimensions of the conspiracy. Sir, in a sense, the period of three years of relative quiet has helped the SIT to unravel this conspiracy.

Very shortly, the SIT will file its report in the appropriate court and the accused persons will be charged. It is at this stage that some people have tried to force the Government's hands. Yesterday, I described it as either adventurist journalism or motivated by political compulsions. Perhaps it is one or the other, I do not know, perhaps it is both. But whoever it is, they, who do these things, do no service to the people of this country, do not have the interest of this country at heart. In fact, I would like the hon. Members to ponder why at this stage, this month, this day, this expose was published in the newspapers. The SIT completed its labours in the second week of January and had reported to the Home Ministry. They were on the anvil of filing their report but required certain sanctions. The sanctions were being considered by the Home Ministry and the Law Ministry. Just at that time, why are attempts made to force Government's hands? Sir I believe, the popular phrase these days is the needle of suspicion. If I may borrow that phrase, the object is that the needle of suspicion should not point to the real accused in the conspiracy but the needle of suspicion should be diverted to the other people so that the real conspirators and real accused are let off. That is the object of this exercise. I have good reasons to say so. Look at how certain people conducted themselves when the trial of Satwant Singh and Kehar Singh was on in the courts? What did the political parties say? What did eminent political leaders do? What positions did they take during the trial, during the appeal and after the judgement? How many impediments were placed in the way of justice being done and what is justice here? Justice can only be according to the law, and under the law, we gave the fairest trial possible and the highest court came to the conclusion, yet impediments were placed. Sir, I do not wish to recall the names of people who attended the Bhog ceremonies. They used every device, every strategem to defeat justice and, I am afraid, if the Government had not been firm, if the Government had not been determined to do what is right under the law, they would have wrecked even at the threshold the attempts by the SIT to commence prosecution in the larger conspiracy case.

Sir, if necessary, while replying to the debate, I shall deal with this at greater length. But I humbly appeal to hon. Members to keep these larger questions in perspective while dealing with this commission's report. Indira Gandhi is dead. Nothing can bring her back to life; no Commission, no SIT, no exposures, no newpapers can bring Indira Gandhi back to life. But we must learn our lessons. The lesson is not only how to protect your Prime Minister; the lesson is not only how to rush emergency medical treatment to your Prime Minister; the lesson is how do you protect the unity and integrity of India; the lesson is how do you defend the democratic system of India, how do you ensure that forces of destabilisation do not wreck this nascent democracy, how do you ensure that forces which are inimical to India do not balkanise our country. Those are the lessons that we must learn. And those lessons will be learnt not by reading from cover to cover this book, but by understanding the background in which this dastardly crime was committed and understanding the dimensions of the conspiracy that was behind it. Not this crime, may be, but at least, an attempt to commit a similar crime. It just so happened that the immediate assailants were able to get at Indira Gandhi's life on the 31st of October and the larger conspirators were baulked. But the larger conspiracy was very much there.

Sir, there is no doubt that there has

been a failure of system; there was failure of the security system; there was failure of the emergency medical care system. But we have learnt our lessons. We have tried to set things right. We want the advice of hon. Members on how we can improve things, how we can do better. We also want the advice of our hon. Members on how we can ensure that this country does not fall a prey to conspirators, to forces of destabilisation, to forces inimical to the unity and integrity of this country.

As regards the Officer who was Special Assistant to the late Prime Minister, he enjoyed the full trust and confidence of Shrimati Indira Gandhi for over 22 years. He left the Government when Shrimati Indira Gandhi demitted office as Prime Minister. He served her loyally when she was in the Opposition for three years. He faced several commissions of inquiry. He went to jail. He was persecuted by the then Government. Yet he was unflinching in his loyalty. But, having regard to the fact that a Commission headed by a Supreme Court Judge had found suspicious circumstances, the SIT thoroughly investigated the involvement of the Officer in either the crime or the conspiracy and has come to the conclusion that he was not involved in any way in the crime or the conspiracy. Government are satisfied that that conclusion has been arrived at after the most thorough investigation of all the circumstances enumerated by Justice Thakkar. The conclusion is supported by material and Government are satisfied that conclusion is correct. Therefore, Sir, the Home Minister, in his statement, has said that Government have accpeted the conclusion of the SIT that the Officer was not in any way involved in either the crime or the conspiracy.

Sir, the Commission's report is on the Table of the House. The action-taken memorandum is on the Table of the House. I have tried to explain the background. I have also tried to share as much information as possible about the larger conspiracy. I request the House to take up the Thakkar Commission Report for discussion.

SHRI N. K .P. SALVE : Sir, I have heard the speech of the Minister of State for Home Affairs with rapt attention. He exercised extreme circumspection while referring to certain very salient features of the two reports, one described as interim and the other as final. But what he said in the end has caused a very grave disquiet in my mind. He said that some of the important men including the leaders of the political parties are deliberately indulging in this exercise so that the needle of suspicion, instead of going to the real conspirators guilty of hatching a bigger conspiracy which ran from Bihar to Nagpur to Indore to Bombay and, ultimately, to Delhi, has its direction changed to some other people who are utterly innocent. I really feel—if I have understood him correctly-nothing can be more disquieting for anyone in India who firmly believes in the institution of parliamentary democracy if one wants to resort to all sorts of methods and trickery to overthrow a legally and democratically elected Government which is possibly the worst possible sin against humanity. To us, democracy is not merely a form of government; it is an article of our faith, faith in the dignity of the individual and the freedom and liberty of the people in the society. That would be completely destroyed if we start taking the law into our own hands and hatch all sorts of conspiracies and indulge in all sorts of political unscrupulousness, to abet directly or indirectly, overtly or covertly, this kind of a conspiracy and, therefore, I want to submit to this Government : For God's sake, as soon as possible, take appropriate action so that the details are available to us. Today, you are not able to share the fullest details with us and you are not able to tell us what the basis is, what the foundation is, on which you have made such very serious allegations, shocking as they are. Sir, I really hope

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

that it will not be long before the entire nation will know the details of what has happened and why it has happened and what has been the role of those who have been showing pious indignation over petty matters.

Sir, coming to the two Reports, the Interim Report and Final Report, I must also submit at the outset that I am deeply anguished and distressed at the attitude of the Opposition that I have seen for the last few days.

Sir, Mrs. Indira Gandhi was the beloved leader of this county, she was not merely the Prime Minister. In an extremely gruesome and brutal manner and mercilessly she was murdered. Bullets were pumped into her frail body and nobody in the world could have saved her, and that is what the Commission deals with. She was not only a great political figure, she was not only a great leader, she was not only one of the greatest statesmen, but she was also a person with whom we in India had some deeper emotional relationship. When she died, we thought that we had lost our mother. Such was the relationship with that lady which the people of this country had. Sir, a poet had written something at that time on her death and I want to repeat it here :

एक हादसा गुजर गया ऐसे,
कि घर घर मर गया जैसे।

Every family was grieved, every family was shocked. And, when the Report comes, in connection with the assassination of such a beloved person, the mother of the nation, that the Opposition people should make an attempt and try to take political mileage out of it is a matter which, more than frustration, more than disgust, causes anguish and distress in my mind and I must protest against the attitude that they have shown

So far as this Report is concerned, the Interim Report is 343 pages and the Final Report is 314 pages, a massive 657 pages, the two volumes. If one refers to it extensively, I think the debate will go on for one month. We have to devote one whole session to this. Mercifully, it is not so. We have to finish this debate today. Therefore, I will refer to only some of the aspects of the matter.

The Home Minister very diplomatically referred to some misnomers, etc. In fact, I found, Sir, that the entire report is very repetitive? It is unduly long. It is dubious. It is cumbersome. It is a typical example of how a report must never be written by a Commissioner. And if it was not for that, for three days we would not have been debating as to what constitutes 'report'. Only if there was some precision, if it had been clarified, at least one thing would have been clear, what according to the Commissioner himself is a report in terms of section 3 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act. But be that as it may, the other thing, as the Home Minister pointed out, is that the interim report deals with three subject-matters which were referred to him. And he conclusively finishes those three matters. And then he comes to the remaining two matters. I must submit, Sir, that my opinion of the Commissioner, Shri Thakkar, so far as the interim report is concerned, in respect of the first three matters, is that he has been reasonably objective in evaluating and shifting whatever evidence he had before him and coming to certain tentative conclusions. I am afraid, I am just unable to agree with the Home Minister when he gave a virtual apology in saying, well, it was not an inquiry under section 8(b) of the Commissions of Inquiry Act but this was all exploratory, that this was a pre-inquiry, investigative exercise. Sir, when a Commission has the authority under a statute, he must strictly work under that statute. He must not take recourse to approach a procedure in which the basic cardinal principles of propriety are bound to be challenged and, therefore, if the officers have been making a grievance, or at least

newspapers have been making a grievance, and journals have been making a grievance on behalf of certain officers against whom there are adverse inferences, the whole procedure was grossly violative of all principles of natural justice. I would not say that these allegations are wholly devoid of merits. How can an arbitrary procedure be adopted? How-ever just and fair he may have wanted to be in his own mind, it was incumbent on him not only to be just and fair to himself but he must appear to the just and fair to everyone else concerned. And this procedure certainly could not have been just and fair.

Nonetheless, I must submit that in the report he has adopted a certain amount of judicial restraint and he has been discreet in the entire approach. His reasons have been reasonable and he has come to certain conclusions with which one may agree or one may not agree fully. In fact, as he himself says, these are tentative conclusions. Well, that deals with the security that was there at the house of the P. M. The Home Minister very skillfully got out by saying : we are learning our lessons. You are not learning your lessons, Mr. Home Minister. What happened on the 2nd October, 1986? If the Prime Minister was saved it was not because of the security arrangements which had been made. It was purely because the fellow, the assassin, did not have the weapon to shoot the Prime Minister with. Otherwise we would have a second assassination and, again, perhaps a second Thakkar Commission going into it. who worries about the inconvenience? It is only the people with vested interests. They talk of inconvenience. this, that and the other. The life of the Prime Minister is the life of the country. And if his life cannot be protected then we can have no faith in the Ministry, in the set-up, which is supposed to protect the lives of average and lesser mortals. If you cannot protect the Prime Minister, we can never trust you to be honest, trustworthy guardians of the life and property of the people as such. What the Thakkar Commission says on this matter is indeed so revealing that one finds that the entire system as such was not merely very highly inefficacious and bogus but it was manned by a set of people who lacked conviction They were people who were not conscious and they were people who were shirkers and who took the entire job in a very very casual manner not knowing what precious trust had been reposed by the country into their hands.

Security of the Prime Minister is, perhaps, the most precious trust of any democracy in any country. And that trust was given into the hands of a bunch of people who proved not only incompetent, who proved not only shirkers, who proved not only guilty of dereliction of duty, but who proved to be a set of people who were extremely third-rate human beings. So, negligence towards what had been entrusted in their hands and what the Commission observes at page 37 are simply appalling. I will not go through it extensively. But this is the finding. If one is driven to agree to this kind of finding, surely the Commissioner of Police was not placed in such a pathetic situation as he now pleads Who will believe that both the Delhi Police and the I. B. were rendered so lacking in resourcefulness? Would these organisations be of any use to the nation if they cannot organise and keep a watch on these officers even when danger to the life of the P. M. of the nation is spelt out and surveillance of persons is deemed necessary for protective security purposes? Are they so poor in resourcefulness and manpower so as to say : "Well, there may be danger from this source, but we do not know how to do the job which we find to be too difficult and beyond us"? This is what he says : "Of what use is an institution of this nature, *viz.*, the security. The whole thing is a farce and the whole thing is bogus".

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

It is in this context that people fell unconvinced. Nobody would complain to you of inconvenience if one feels that, yes, this inconvenience is worth it because what was at stake was the life of the Prime Minister of the country in a democracy which is invaluable and very precious. But you have all the troubles for everyone else who will never do anything to him and you are so utterly weak, so loose and so utterly unprepared at a point where you need to be prepared yourself. I do hope the Home Minister would realise the indignation of this party at the repeated failures of the security.

Ultimately, I understand his humility in asking us to give some suggestions. I do not think anyone of us is a professional who can tell him what he ought to do. There is no dirth of such professional who can tell him what needs to be done and how should the life of one single individual who symbolises the very systems itself be protected. I do hope that appropriate measures would be taken. I do not even today consider security as adequate, security as sufficient, security indeed foolproof. The Commission itself say: "You are worried about what people may have to say and what inconvenience it may cause to others". Ultimately, it is not of the choosing of the Prime Minister. On 12th of July, 1984, an interview was given by Jagjit Singh Chauhan which is on page 11 of the Final Report. I have never seen this man. I have only been reading about him. I thought he was an extremely eccentric fellow who should be dismissed as some sort of cranky or some eccentric fellow. But when I read, there is something in it and I quote. This is what he said : "In a reply on the B B. C. to 'do you want to see the downfall of Mrs. Gandhi's Government?', Chauhan answered :

> "You will see the Sikh history. Nobody in the history who has touched his holy place was ever left alive and I tell you today—you may not call it a prophecy. But within a few days you will have the news that Mrs. Gandhi and her family has been beheaded. That is what the Sikhs will do, I tell you. I am sorry to say that. It will definitely hurt you but it will happen. That is history, I cannot change that history."

And that is not enough, Sir. Thereafter, a supposedly high-powered security arrangement had been made, and a meeting took place on the 10th of June, 1984. One of the important decisions taken in that meeting of the 10th of July, 1984 was that in view of all this, the Sikhs should not be placed at strategic points which were only six in number. And how many were the Sikh in the Security? Only 13.

Now this situation having been taken and, perhaps, maintained, and the Sikhs removed from strategic points to what has been described as peripheral areas, on 19th of June, 1984, Mr. Dhawan is alleged to have given certain statement as a result of which the Sikhs were posted back again to strategic points. What were the instructions given by Mrs. Gandhi to Mr. Dhawan, what were the instructions given by Mr. Dhawan to the person concerned, and how the person concerned who received the instruction understood it to be, that is a subject matter of controversy, but that is irrelevant for the purposes of the point which I am making. Mind you, on the 10th of June, the meeting takes place, and on 19th of June this kind of a thing happens, and the Sikhs have come back on duty. Then on 19th of July, 1984, a very significant event takes place. The Indian Airlines plane is hijacked to Lahore from Srinagar. One of the hijackers happened to be a Sikh young man who was on the security staff of Mr. Jagannath Kaushik. When this happened, a memorandum was sent by the IB that in view of this, and in view of the material in the possession of the IB, it is to their knowledge that the life of Mrs. Gandhi is in very serious danger and action must be taken to

ensure that she is protected, that the Sikh security guards posted at PM House themselves posed a security risk. I am quoting this. Now, this was made available to them. And what happened thereafter from 19th of July? Thereafter, as a result of this, what they were asked was, at least kindly enquire fully into the character and antecedents of those who were attending on Mrs. Gandhi. None of these things happened. And, Sir, what is really amazing to me is that all these top bureaucrats and top officials who now today find fault that the redeployment was ordered by Mrs. Gandhi or without the authority of Mrs. Gandhi by Mr. Dhawan, they were—many of them—themselves responsible for arranging the security itself and were meeting every day Mrs. Gandhi. And none of them, there is nothing on record to show that any one of them, ever told Mrs. Gandhi, "we have definite information from IB; for God's sake, we will post the Sikhs, but we will not post the Sikhs back to strategic points". That is number one. The minimum that could have been done is that if they are to be posted at strategic points, their character and antecedents could have been verified with some degree of seriousness and meticulousness, and then one could have come to the conclusion that if at all some Sikhs have to be posted at strategic points, who they ought to be or at least who they ought not to be. Nothing of the sort was done. Therefore, it is the fault not only of the people in the Security who evolved the scheme, etc., but also all those who were connected with ensuring, looking after, Madam's security.

4.00 P.M.

I now come to the final report. I will just take five minutes more. When I see the final report, I find that Justice Thakkar had completely divested himself in some matters of judicial caution and restraint. It is surprising that a person of his stature, a sitting Judge of the Supreme Court, should have really proceeded in this manner in a matter of this kind before he suspected some people of complicity for the murder of the Prime Minister. Firstly, he not merely adopted a procedure which did not smack of this kind of violation of all sorts of principles of natural justice and totally bereft and devoid of the sanctity of the rules or the statutory provisions of the Commissions of Inquiry Act but while giving the reasons before coming to the conclusion that he suspected such a thing should have happened, even though it was a pre-enqtiry, investigative exercise, he was in a position to say that the needle of suspicion points towards Mr. R. K. Dhawan and that he was an accomplice. This is the most unfortunate indictment of a man who had devoutly and devoted served the late Prime Minister like his mother, rising from a small stenographer to the position of a Special Assistant not only by dint of his brilliance and ability but also by dint of his loyalty to the Madam. If somebody thinks that the Madam was incapable of judging a person's loyalty and rewarding his loyalty, he is tragically mistaken.

Sir, various reasons have been enumerated.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Mr. Salve, I would just ask you. Why do you think that he came to such a conclusion? (*Interruptions*) I am asking Mr. Salve. Why do you interrupt? The Chair is there. If he does not want to yield, he will not yield. Why do you interrupt me every time like this? (*Interruptions*) it is for Mr. Salve to answer if he can answer . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: On pages 27 and 28, Justice Thakkar had used the word 'exploration'. I am using the same terminology. I do not think such a term is used in legal pharaseology. I have not come across this kind of a term 'exploration' being used in a legal sense

[Shri N.K.P. Salve]

or in a quasi-legal sense. It is not a term of art in any sense of the term.

Justice Thakkar had given five reasons. One is that on the 19th July, 1984 when instructions were issued to redeploy sikhs, though Mr Dhawan said that it was done at the behest of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Justice Thakkar came to the conclusion that it was not conclusively established that it was at the behest of Mrs. Gandhi and that, perhaps, on his own, he gave instructions in the name of Mrs. Gandhi. This is one of the reasons. The second reason is, he was friendly with Beant. A person can be friendly with so many people in so many ways. This is another reason which has been given. The third reason is, in his answers, Mr. Dhawan was wobbling, evasive and lacking in credibility. If you really look at some of the answers given—I have not come across in my life such answers—these are the answers of a man who is forthright, unequivocal, convincing, clear and honest. If there had been wobbling, I am afraid it was someone else who seemed to have been wobbling. Then he says that it appeared to him that he was snooping around Mrs. Gandhi. You come here for a few days and say that he was snooping around. For years he served Mrs. Gandhi. I myself know what kind of hardship he had to go through during the Janata regime and in our own time he should have been subjected to another hardship. When history is written he will be vindicated. History will vindicate the honour of the man, the character of the man and the manner in which he behaved. I would like to submit one thing. To say that he was snooping around is to allow one's imagination run absolutely wild, amuck. And the fifth reason is that he shifted the time of interview on 31st of October, 1984, which was given to an Irish team which was originally 8.30 A.M. Mr. Dhawan, according to this Commissioner, was responsible for managing and manipulating the time to 8.45 A.M. or even 9 A.M. and that facilitated the crime. When I repeat it, I see you smile. One really is grieved at this kind of, if I may use the words, entirely puerile reasoning. Let us take the time business. About re-deployment I will come to later on. And about wobbling, I will refer to some of the answers that he has given.

Let us take the question of time. It is the evidence on record—I do not want to go extensively into it, but I want to submit to you, Sir, — number one, that Sardar Beant Singh was put on duty as per the roster from 1.30 P.M. onwards. He changed his duty and for that SI Chaturvedi has been condemned in this report that he permitted him to change his timing from 1.30 to 7.30. So, he came to duty at 7.30 A.M. Satwant Singh was on beat duty somewhere else and he changed his duty with one Constable Hari Krishan Lal and took the duty at TMC gate. That is how late Sardar Beant Singh and late Sardar Satwant Singh managed themselves to be at the TMC gate, not only in violation of the strict written instructions that duties will not be allowed to be changed — that also is there on record, they had to be complied with and duties had to be discharged according to the roster, the timing could not be changed, the place could not be changed—but this was changed merrily with the help of the senior people and other colleagues.

So, from 7.30 onwards they were there and they were there until they successfully thereafter killed the Prime Minister. One fails to understand, without even writing as much as a sentence as to how this shifting of the time could have helped or facilitated the assassination, he comes to the conclusion that the shifting of the time facilitated the assassination.

They were there already at 7.30 A.M.. If the position had been that they came there only at 9 o'clock or at 9.05 A.M., went and shot her dead, perhaps one could have thought that. What is more important is that in the changing of the duties of these two, there was no hand of Mr. Dhawan, because the Commissioner, Mr. Thakkar, says that for that Satwant and Beant were responsible and two other officials were responsible for these people changing their duties and coming to TMC gate. No complicity of Mr. Dhawan is involved in this kind of a thing. As a result of change in timing, it is impossible to find out as to how Mr Dhawan or Mr. Beant Singh found it more convenient to shoot Mrs. Gandhi, how did the change in the timing facilitate the murder? The elementary question, even to be able to suspect somebody, unless one is dispossessed of rational faculty, is : should you not take this into account, well, he has done it, what is the motive?

On page 141 of the Final Report, he says, *the motive is difficult to find as to* why he got Mrs. Gandhi murdered. But then he comes to the theory of the rule of evidence that every time, motive is not discernible. My friends will say, that is a correct proposition of law. Yes, it is there, the motive may not be discernible, but then it is always known to the person who commits a crime. To say that he does not himself know what the motive is rewriting the entire Evidence law of the world. A person commits a crime, and a crime of murder, and a crime of murder of a person and that too of a Prime Minister, without any motive ! On the other hand, I submit, if there was a motive, there was one more important motive for Mr. Dhawan to ensure that Prime Minister Indira Gandhi continues to be Prime Minister, because there were certain factions working and he knew that if ever the Prime Minister is not there to protect him, maybe he would find himself thrown before a couple of wolves. There was a positive motive for him to ensure that the Prime Minister lives, and lives long and remains as Prime Minister. And here is the Commission, a Supreme Court Judge, whose very wild flight of imagination does not enable him to attribute a motive to him because, perhaps, that would have been the height of absurdity. So, he then finds this reason, "Well, I need not find a motive at all. Some-times even the person committing the crime does not know what the motive is".

Sir, as to the redeployment, my respectful submission is, I am going to read two or three replies of Mr. Dhawan, which show that he was far from wobbling. He replied with absolute conviction, with total certainty and unequivocality. Apart from that, the crucial question which comes for consideration is : when does he do the redeployment on 19th of June, 1984. When does the assassination take place on 31st of October, 1984 ? Is it that Mr. Dhawan had brought these people back in the hope that after five months they will be able to assassinate and things would not be taken care of because security was not his domain? Even the Commission does not say that security was his domain and he was entitled to make alterations and changes in the security. What happened in the five months? If it was ever to be found out — it is a very important reason, Sir,— that without Mrs. Gandhi's permission he has asked for this kind of an important change in the deployment of the secruity people at vantage and strategic security points, what would have been his fate? Nobody asks in five months' time, when they should have asked, when it was the duty of those people concerned to have so asked. In fact, Sir, Mr. Kao is condemned for the fact that when he was meeting her every week, and when he was in charge of organizing the security, he knew that this kind of a redeployment was a very grievous threat to the security, which was making the entire security very highly porous. Why did he not, even by implication, in any manner whatsoever, put it to

[Shri N.K. Salve]

Madam, "Madam, we have received this kind of IB information consequent upon the hijacking of the plane from Srinagar to Lahore, that there are Sikhs posted who might be after your life, after your blood". But, for all these, while Mr. Kao is condemned for his failure to ask this kind of a thing, other people are condemned for not doing their duty in re-changing the order of the 19th of June, 1984. Mr. Dhawan, Just like an *ex cathedra* pronouncement, told, "No, Mrs. Gandhi could not have done this. It is difficult to believe Mrs. Gandhi". Why is it difficult to believe, when it could have been verified in five months' time? The question is, if a murder has taken place thereafter, as a result of the redeployment, the needle of suspicion only goes to Mr. Dhawan, and all those people — top to bottom—who were responsible for the security but allowed the change of duty, are only held—they were amiss—for only dereliction of duty, but Mr. Dhawan gets the blame for fixing up this kind of a murder.

Sir, I must say that the entire reasoning, the five reasons which he has given, is utterly puerile, utterly childish, devoid of any merit. It is amazing that a person could have been so naive. I only hope that Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta did not suggest that if he was not naive he was not dishonest or that he was doing this to . . .

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA : Sir, I agree with that. I am just putting it in another way. You misunderstood me.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Are you trying to suggest that perhaps he was trying to subserve the cause of somebody else?

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: I said, what motivated him to write like this? This is my point . . . *(Interruptions)* . . .

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: From the way you asked me, it appeared to me that you want to deal with this also, whether he is motivated by some extraneous considerations, extraneous to the merits, extraneous to the reasons which he has given and which, as I said, are unacceptable. It could only be that someone was dictating to him, "Kindly have Mr. Dhawan framed into this pillory, get him condemned, get him done so that it will suit the convenience of some of them." If that is what you are suggesting, could be it was that—I have nothing to say. I would not go by that. I would not, for a moment, think that a Surpreme Court Judge was so dishonest as that.

Sir, I want to show how straightforward, forthright have been the answers of Mr. Dhawan. I will just refer briefly to some of them, and I will have done on what I have to submit. Mr. Dhawan was asked, and this is on page 153:

> "What is your view with regard to security arrangements made for the late Prime Minister in General; and or on the day of the occurrence in particular?"

His answer is:

> "The details of the security arrangements made are not known to me as these were being made by I. B."

This is not being challenged.

> "So, it is not possible for me to comment of these. The arragements on the day of the occurrence were certainly not at all proper."

Then the question was:

> "(a) Do you think that the occurrence could have been prevented if some better arrangements were made?"
>
> "(b) If yes, what arrangements?"

The answer is:

> "(a) and (b) There is no doubt that the occurrence would have been pre-

vented in case proper arrangements were made. There should have been proper checking and nobody should have been allowed to change their places or hours of duty."

What is wobbling about it, what is evasive about it? People are allowed to change their duty. Both of them were allowed to come to the TMC when it was not their duty to be at that place. They come and shoot finding her as a sitting duck as it were.

At another place, on page 169, again referring to the security business, he says:

"It was for Heads and officers of the departments responsible for security of the Prime Minister to apprise her about all the reasons of their action or inefficacy of her instructions and stress upon her to withdraw them if they felt that they ought not to be insisted upon by her."

That means redeployment. If that was not proper, then, it was not he who was to be blamed but somebody else.

But then the most revealing submission he makes is on page 191. He says:

"In the end I may add that I presume that the Hon'ble Commission already knows that all matters pertaining to the security of the late Prime Minister were being attended to and discussed at least by the following gentlemen officially:—

1. Shri P. C. Alexander — Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister.

2. Shri R. N. Kao—Senior Security Advisor.

3. Shri Kapoor—Director, Intelligence Bureau.

"Shri Alexander was a close confidant of the late Prime Minister. He used to meet her every day in the morning as a first thing when she went to South Block. Often he used to come to PM's House to discuss urgent matter."

Shri Kao was a very close confidant of the late Prime Minister. He used to meet her quite often. He also used to report to the Prime Minister on security matters."

In the end, this is what he says, Sir:

"These gentlemen cannot possibly deny that the sikh security personnel were originally removed after the army action with their knowledge, consent, instructions. They also cannot deny that it was within their knowledge that they were brought back. It is inevitable, natural and in the ordinary course of their official duty that these gentlemen, particularly her close confidants who met her almost daily must have had talk with her about the instructions which she directed me to convey and which I passed on to Shri Gupta."

Why was Dr. Alexander not examined? If there is this kind of a serious doubt, this kind of a reply which casts very serious doubts on the quality of the duty which Dr. Alexander was rendering as the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister, which impinges on the question of his dereliction, would not Dr. Alexander have been asked: "All right, Dr. Alexander, why is it that knowing that the redeployment was such a serious hazard, you did not point it out to the Prime Minister?" This was not done which makes one feel that all is not well.

Then, finally, I come to page 213, and this is what Mr. Dhawan says in one of his replies, Sir:

[Shri N.K.P. Salve]

"Incidentally, the self supporting and extenuating version of the instructions given by Shri Gupta pales into insignificance in the light of the most serious security lapses which have revealed in the Press and which might also have come to the notice of this Hon'ble Commission. Shri Fotedar is reported to have stated in a statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. that he had given strict instructions that no sikh security personnel should be posted at the TMC gate. The Hon'ble Prime Minister has stated in a press interview that he noticed menacing behaviour on the part of Satwant Singh and had given instructions for his removal. Yet he continued to remain part of the security personnel at the late PM's House. And on the fateful day, not only one, but two sikh secruity men were posted together at the TMC gate and one of them happened to be that very Satwant Singh. One wonders what Shri Gupta's explanation can be." To all these reasons—there are five in number—you multiply zero by any number, whether it is 2 or 5 or 10 or 50, the result is zero. My perennial regret is that a person sitting as a Judge of the Supreme Court should allow his mind to be baised by these factors by change in the timing, which time has nothing to do with the facility of these people coming to murder her absolutely, there was no nexus between the two. They were there well entrenched from 7.30 and they were to be there until 1.30.

On deployment also he was not responsible.

I submit one thing. It is also on record here that Mr. Kao said, if he had perhaps mentioned this to her, she would not have agreed. I agree with Mr. Kao, as those of us who had the great privilege in life to work with her know how allergic she was to any security, which created a distance between her and the people. I had myself been snubbed several times for trying to adhere to security, but one has to take that kind of snubbing from Mrs. Gandhi, because she was absolutely and utterly unmindful, oblivious to the needs of protecting herself. She thought it was a big hoax. Security problem was created by those who had vested interest in security. And she thought nobody would ever come and kill her. 'And if someone came and killed her, let him kill me. The secrutiy people will not be able to protect me.' And ultimately what she thought has come about.

I have submitted what I have to submit in this matter. In the end I only want to submit with very great regret that Mrs. Gandhi was murdered. But the statement that the needle of suspicion points to Mr. Dhawan in the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi shall go down in the history as the greatest murder of truth or judicial propriety.

कृषि मंत्री (श्री भजन लाल): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, बड़े खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अपोजीशन हाउस में नहीं है, बोलने का और बात करने का असली मजा तभी आता है जब सामने अपोजीशन बैठे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई): तो 5-7 मिनट में खत्म कर दीजिए।

श्री भजन लाल: नहीं है, इसीलिए दुख है हमें इस बात का। मेरे कहने का मतलब है कि अपोजीशन हाउस में नहीं है इसलिए खेद है हमें। अपोजीशन का होना हाउस में नितांत आवश्यक है। लेकिन खेद की बात इसलिए मैं कहता हूं कि अपोजीशन का भी एक रोल होता है प्रजातंत्र में, लेकिन जिस तरह का रोल पिछले दो सालों से देखने को मिला है, इस तरह का रोल अपोजीशन का हमने कभी देखा नहीं। हमारा भी बहुत लंबाअर्सा हो गया है, प्रजातंत्र में, पोलिटिक्स में। आप जानते हैं कि पहले अपोजीशन बोफोर्स को लेकर इतना उछालने में लगी रही कि पता नहीं बोफोर्स से क्या हो जायेगा और कितनी सरकार की और प्रधान मंत्री की

प्रतिष्ठा कम हो जायेगी। पिछले अधिवेशन में आपने देखा कि बिल्कुल हवा निकल गयी बोफोर्स की, बिल्कुल पंक्चर हो गया बोफोर्स, उसमें कुछ था ही नहीं। आप जानते हैं कि ऐसा ढोल का पोल बना रखा था कि उस ढोल के पोल की बिल्कुल हवा निकल गयी तो उनके पास और कोई बात कहने को नहीं रही, और कोई बात नहीं रही तो फिर ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को लेकर यह कहा कि ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को टेबुल करो, हाउस में रखो और उसका कुछ अंश लीक करके एक दो अखबारों में छपवा दिया। श्रीमन, आप जानते हैं कि यह कैसे लीक हुई, किसके पास रिपोर्ट थी . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: वह बताइये कि कैसे लीक हुई ?

श्री भजन लाल: इस बात को सब लोग जानते हैं . . . .**(व्यवधान)** सुनने की कृपा करें।

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: This is very important when he is raising the issue. In the other House also . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Let him have his say.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: I know there are so many people who had this report. Who has leaked it, this should be told.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Leaking is there ...(*Interruptions*).

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: There are so many people who have this report. May I know who has leaked out this report? This must be told here.

श्री भजन लाल: श्रीमन्, आप जानते हैं और चिमनभाई मेहता भी जानते हैं। यह मुझ से क्या पूछते हैं? ..... **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: एक तो यहां कोई बोलने वाला नहीं है और जब कोई बोलता है, तो उसकी बात सुनते नहीं हैं। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश): आप अपोज़ीशन में जाकर बैठिये ना। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री भजन लाल: यह अच्छी तरह जानते हैं और जानते-बूझते पूछते हैं कि किसके पास रिपोर्ट थी? . . . . **(व्यवधान)** मुझे नाम लेने में भी कोई एतराज नहीं है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please sit down. He knows what he is saying.

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: तो नाम दे दीजिए ना। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, names cannot be given. Please sit down.

एक माननीय सदस्य: आप बीच में क्यों बोलते हैं? . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: यह कांग्रेस में हैं कि विरोधी दल में हैं? . . . . **(व्यवधान)** बोलने का अधिकार है तो पार्टी में बोलियेगा। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: कांग्रेस का फिरोज गांधी ने काफी एक्सपोज़र किया है।

श्री भजन लाल: अच्छा है, मैंने जो बात कही है उसमें कोई शक नहीं, पर कोई भाई हमारे में से तो बात कहने के लिए खड़ा हुआ। अपोज़ीशन का रोल तो थोड़ा बहुत अदा कर रहे हैं। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: हां, करना चाहिए। फिरोज गांधी ने तो . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री भजन लाल: अच्छा है, अपोज़ीशन का रोल अदा करने के लिए कोई साहब तो मिले।

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: अब तो आपको खेद नहीं रहना चाहिए। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री भजन लाल: खेद की बात नहीं, लेकिन मैं कहता हूं कि जिनके पास यह रिपोर्ट थी, उनके बारे में आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि यह कैसे लीक हुई, क्यों लीक हुई?

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: अगर जानना हो, तो मैं बता दूं। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री भजन लाल: नहीं, जब आपकी बारी आएगी तब बताना। मैंने तो आपसे नहीं पूछा है। . . **(व्यवधान)**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The Home Ministry will take care of that . . . . *(Interruptions)* . . . . .

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Let the Chairman handle everything.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He cannot give you the names.

श्री भजन लाल: इसको लीक करके इस देश के सामने एक नया शोशा छोड़ने के लिए . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई): कभी-कभी नाम नहीं देना पड़ता है। आप सब समझदार हैं। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि चिमनभाई मेहता की कांग्रेस के इस सदन में इनकी क्या पोजीशन है?

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: वह यहां सदन में नहीं हैं, इसलिए मैं किसी का नाम नहीं लेता। इतनी तो हमें रिस्ट्रिक्शन रखनी चाहिए।

श्री भजन लाल: यह भी ठक्कर कमीशन के जिम्मे लगाना पड़ेगा कि यह कौन सी पार्टी में हैं। यह भी इन्कवायरी करवानी पड़ेगी ठक्कर कमीशन से कि यह किसी पार्टी में हैं? . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: आप इन्कवायरी करवाइये। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: आप इन्कवायरी करवाइये। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)** Leakage is a very vital matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no, please sit down. You are making a speech. I have not asked you to speak.

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: अच्छा, लीकेज कौन करेगा? जिनको फायदा होने वाला है, वह करेगा। धवन साहब के आने से किसका नुकसान हुआ है? . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई): आप बैठ जाइये। . . . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री भजन लाल: उन्हीं लोगों का हुआ है जो लीक करने वाले थे। श्रीमन्, मैं यह कह रहा था कि ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को लीक करके सारे मुल्क में एक ऐसी हवा पैदा करने की कोशिश की इन्होंने कि पता नहीं ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में क्या छिपा हुआ है, क्या उसमें कुछ ऐसी अहम बात है जो सरकार छिपाना चाहती है।

गृह मंत्री जी ने सदन में कहा कि देशहित में यह ठीक नहीं रहेगा। यह फिर और भी मजबूती से कहने लग गये कि नहीं, रिपोर्ट हर हालत में पेश होनी चाहिए।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उनकी भावना की कद्र करते हुए, कि यह लोगों के चुने हुए नुमाइंदे हैं, यह रिपोर्ट को देखना चाहते हैं, तो इस रिपोर्ट को सभा पटल पर रखना चाहिए। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बड़ा शानदार निर्णय लिया और पूरी रिपोर्ट आप देखते हैं, फाइनल रिपोर्ट भी इस सदन के पटल पर रखी गई।

अब वह क्या कहते हैं कि साहब, इसकी पूरी सामग्री नहीं रखी गई, और कोई बहाना इनके पास नहीं रहा है। अब एक ही बात रह गई कि पूरी सामग्री इन्होंने नहीं रखी।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री आनन्द शर्मा) पीठासीन हुए]

श्रीमन् आप जानते हैं कि राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी की भी हत्या हुई थी इस मुल्क में, उसके लिए कमीशन बना, सुभाष चंद्र बोस के लिए कमीशन बना, एल०एन० मिश्र के लिए कमीशन बना, — उपाध्याय के लिए कमीशन बना, कितने कमीशन बने हैं, इस मुल्क में। रिपोर्टें हाउस में रखी गई है, कुछ रिपोर्टें डिमांड होने पर रखी गई और कुछ नहीं रखी गई, लेकिन पूरी सामग्री जिसमें कितने आदमियों से पूछताछ करनी पड़ती है, कितने आदमियों के पास सम्मन भेजने पड़ते हैं और आगे कार्यवाही करनी पड़ती है, कई के खिलाफ एक्शन लेना पड़ता है, अगर पूरी सामग्री सदन के अन्दर आ जाए तो कितनी रुकावटें उसमें आ जायेंगी आगे कार्यवाही करने के बारे में कितनी बाधाएं सामने आ सकती हैं, यह आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। इनके पास कुछ रहा नहीं तो कह दिया कि पूरी सामग्री पेश करो। सामग्री पेश करने से पहले श्रीमान्, एक बात और कही जो आप ने पढ़ा होगा अखबारों में, क्या कहा कि जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कह दिया कि हम 27 तारीख को जब पार्लियामेंट बैठेगी दोबारा तो सोमवार को सदन में रिपोर्ट पेश करेंगे, पेश करने की कार्यवाही करेंगे, उसी दिन यानि अगले दिन अपोजीशन ने कह दिया कि साहब रिपोर्ट तो बदल दी गई। आप इसका अंदाजा लगा सकते हैं कितने गैर-जिम्मेदाराना इन लोगों ने यह बात की है? जब रिपोर्ट पेश करने की बात आ गई तो इन्होंने सोचा कि अब हमारे पास क्या रह गया और कुछ नहीं मिला तो कह दिया कि रिपोर्ट बदल दी गई। जब देखा कि रिपोर्ट तो बदली नहीं गई, अच्छा, रिपोर्ट बदलने का सवाल कैसे पैदा हो सकता है क्योंकि रिपोर्ट एक जगह थोड़े ही है, ठक्कर कमीशन के पास भी रिपोर्ट है, जो पहले चिदम्बरम् साहब की जगह बैठते थे उनके पास भी रिपोर्ट है, यह आप जानते हैं अच्छी तरह से, और जब देखा कि रिपोर्ट नहीं बदली गई तब इस बात पर आ गए कि पूरी सामग्री पेश करो।

इनका एक ही मकसद है कि इलेकशन नज़दीक आ रहे हैं इसलिए इलेकशन तक कोई न कोई बात हम खड़ी रखें जिससे सरकार की पोज़ीशन खराब होती रहे। लेकिन श्रीमन, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं सरकार की पोज़ीशन इन बातों से खराब होने के बजाय ज्यादा मजबूत होती है। जब अपोजीशन के पास कुछ कहने को नहीं होता और जो बगैर मतलब की, बगैर सार की, बगैर आधार की जो लोग बात करते हैं, इनका क्या इखलाक है, यह मैं इनसे पूछना चाहता हूं। पहले यह रिपोर्ट की बात करते थे और जब रिपोर्ट पेश कर दी तो कहने लगे कि इसमें यह नहीं इसमें वह नहीं, कम से कम सामने बैठ करके इस रिपोर्ट के बारे में चर्चा करते, बात करते कि साहब, इसमें यह कमी है और यह होना चाहिए। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ठीक कहा कि अब रिपोर्ट पेश करने का समय आ गया है इसलिए हम रिपोर्ट पेश कर रहे हैं। इस रिपोर्ट को आप जानते हैं कि यह 1986 में आई थी तीन पौने तीन साल हो गए, आज तक यह बोले नहीं। अब आज इनके पेट में क्या दर्द हो गया? यह चाहते थे कि इलेकशन नज़दीक आएं तब हम कुछ बात कहें, लेकिन इनके पास कहने को कुछ नहीं इसलिए नहीं कहा इन्होंने, और यह एक बड़ी भारी साज़िश है। यह सारे का सारा मसला, एक साज़िश के तहत अपोजीशन कर रही है। साज़िश क्या है? साज़िश कोई धवन के खिलाफ नहीं है, साज़िश प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ है। प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ इसलिए है कि ये उन लोगों की मदद करना चाहते हैं जो इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या की साजिश में शामिल थे। उनकी मदद करने के लिए इस तरह की कार्यवाही यह करना चाहते हैं। इनको रातों-रात इंदिरा गांधी से हमदर्दी पैदा हो गई। हमें तो बहुत खुशी है कि एक ही रात में इनको इंदिरा जी से हमदर्दी पैदा हो गई । जो इंदिरा गांधी के हत्यारे थे जिनके बारे में एक-आध लीडर को छोड़ कर कौन सा ऐसा लीडर है जिसने यह नहीं कहा सतवंत सिंह और केहर सिंह के बारे मे कि इनको फांसी न दी जाए। इस सदन के एक मैम्बर बाकायदा उनके एक वकील हैं और किस तरह की वकालत उन्होंने की है, यह कहना मेरे लिए मुनासिब नहीं है, लेकिन कुछ इंसान का इखलाक भी होता है, कुछ मर्यादाएं भी होती हैं, कुछ सिद्धांत भी होते हैं, सारी वकालत यह तो नहीं कि पैसे के लिए ही सब कुछ है, लेकिन कुछ मर्यादा से बाहर जा कर इन लोगों ने बात की हो और यहां तक आ गए कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले के खिलाफ भी कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जो फैसला है प्रधान मंत्री जी को और राष्ट्रपति जी को उनको फांसी नहीं देनी चाहिए और छोड़ देना चहिए। आज इंदिरा गांधी जी के हत्यारों के लिए यह कहें कि उनको छोड़ देना चाहिए और आज इंदिरा गांधी की जो साजिश में हैं उन लोगों को छुड़ाना चाहते हैं? इनका बावेला इसलिए रिपोर्ट पेश करने का ज्यादा था कि इंदिरा गांधी के मुकदमें में जिनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही होने वाली है, जिन लोगों के, खिलाफ जिनका साजिश में और भी हाथ है, उनके खिलाफ आगे की कार्यवाही मध्यम पड़ जाए, आगे की कार्यवाही में कोई न कोई बाधा पड़ जाए या आगे की कार्यवाही में

[श्री भजन लाल]

पहले से कुछ ऐसी भावना बन जाए या कोर्ट में उनको कुछ ऐसा मौका मिल जाए जिससे कि आगे की कार्यवाही पूरी न हो, इस बात को लेकर के ये लोग लगे हुए हैं। इनका एक ही मकसद है, और कुछ नहीं कि किस तरह से हम इस सरकार को बदनाम कर सकते हैं बगैर किसी बात के, बगैर किसी प्रूफ के, बगैर किसी सबूत के। लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि इस देश के लोग इतने भोले नहीं हैं बल्कि इस देश के लोग बड़े समझदार हैं और वे जानते हैं कि कौन व्यक्ति, कौन सी पार्टी, कौन सा लीडर क्या बात कहता है, उसमें क्या सार है, और उसमें कितनी सच्चाई है, कितना झूठ है?

महोदय, आप जानते हैं किस तरह से इन्होंने आर०के० धवन के बारे में कह दिया कि साहब, बड़ा भारी उसका हाथ था, इन्दिरा जी की हत्या में और सूई, पता नहीं किस तरह की बात चल पड़ी देश के अंदर, ऐसा संकेत है, सूई का रुख धवन की तरफ है। लेकिन श्रीमन्, आप भी अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं धवन के बारे में, सारा सदन जानता है, सारा देश जानता है और जैसा कि मेरे से पहले साल्वे साहब, जो एक लायक और बहुत काबिल वकील हैं और अच्छे पार्लियामेंटेरियन भी हैं और चिदंबरम साहब ने बड़े अच्छे तरीके से इस संबंध में सारी बातें सदन को बताईं। श्रीमन्, मैं इतनी बात कहना चाहता हूं कि धवन के लिए अगर सब कुछ था तो वह इंदिरा गांधी थी, मां से भी ज्यादा इंदिरा गांधी थी। इस परिवार में वह पला, सारा जीवन इस परिवार के लिए उसका गया, उसने सारी अपनी जिंदगी इस बात के लिए बर्बाद की कि किस तरह से मैं लॉयल रह सकता हू इस परिवार के लिए और किस तरह से इस काम को सर-अंजाम दे सकता हूं, शादी तक भी उस आदमी ने नहीं की। आप जानते हैं, कितनी कठिन ड्यूटी होती है, जो प्राइम-मिनिस्टर के साथ रहते हैं, रात को दो बजे से पहले वह फारिग नहीं हो सकते, सुबह सात बजे फिर हाजिर होना पड़ता है। इतनी वफादारी के साथ इस व्यक्ति ने काम किया है।

महोदय, फिर टाइम की बात आई। साल्वे साहब ने ठीक कहा, टाईम तो आप जानते हैं, एम०पी० भी बदलते हैं सुबह से शाम तक लोगों को मिलने का। टाईम देते हैं लोगों को सुबह आठ बजे आ जाना, फिर कह देते हैं कि आठ बजे मेरी कोई मीटिंग हो गई इसलिए अब दस बजे आना।

श्री गुलाम रसूल मट्टू (जम्मू और काश्मीर): मिनिस्टरों का तो बदलता ही है।

श्री भजन लाल: मिनिस्टरों का तो आप जानते हैं कि किस तरह कितना टाईम हम लोगों को बदलना पड़ता है। यह क्या बात है? आर० के० धवन को जनता पार्टी के वक्त में, हमने नजदीक से देखा है, जनता पार्टी के वक्त में इस आदमी को तीन साल तक कितना परेशान किया गया। उनके 80 साल के पिता को जेल में भेजा गया, केस बनाकर सगे भाई को अंदर कर दिया गया। उस समय धवन के खिलाफ केस, कज़न ब्रदर के खिलाफ केस कोई ऐसा रिश्तेदार बाकी नहीं बचा था। उस वक्त कितनी परेशानी का सामना करना पड़ा धवन को? इस व्यक्ति को क्या-क्या प्रलोभन दिए गए? उसको इतने प्रलोभन दिए गए कि धवन तेरे को हम यह कर देते हैं, तू अगर यह बता दे? मगर उसने कहा-क्या बता दूं? कहा गया-जिन बातों का पता है, वह बता दो। उसने कहा-इंदिरा गांधी की छवि एक सफेद चादर की तरह है, बेदाग छवि है, तुम किसके बारे में पूछना चाहते हो मेरे से। उस व्यक्ति का ऐसा किरदार रहा और सारा देश जानता है कि पिछले चार साल में भी उसको बहुत परेशानियों का सामना करना पड़ा। इसमें दो राय नहीं हैं। चार साल परेशानियों का सामना करने के बावजूद उस आदमी ने एक लफ्ज नहीं कहा, एक लफ्ज भी गलत बात करने की उसने कोशिश नहीं की।

महोदय, अब जब उस आदमी की बात रिपोर्ट में आई तो बावेला खड़ा हो गया। अपोजीशन के पेट में भी दर्द हो गया कि धवन के आने से पोलिटिकली और भी ज्यादा मजबूती आ जाएगी, इसलिए उनको भी तकलीफ हो गई कि किस तरह से धवन को अलग किया जाय। लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि कमीशन कोई भी बैठे, कमीशन कहता है कि मुझे इसमें जरा शक है, बाकी सरकार आगे इसको देख ले। बकायदा एस. आई. टी., जिसमें बकायदा आई. जी. रेंक के आफीसर डायरेक्टर जनरल पुलिस हैं, उन्होंने उसकी जांच की। वह एक-एक बात की तह में गए हैं और तह में जाकर के उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी है कि धवन बिल्कुल निर्दोष है, उसका कोई दोष नहीं है। यह रिपोर्ट आ गई, अब आप जानते हैं, कोर्ट में पेश होनी है, रिपोर्ट जब कोर्ट में रिपोर्ट पेश होती है तो बकायदा पब्लिक डाक्यूमेंट वह हो जाती है। कोई भी उसको वहां से

देश सकता है, कोई प्रोब्लम की बात नहीं है। लेकिन किस तरह से इन लोगों ने हाऊस को गुमराह करने की कोशिश की? मैं तो इतनी बात कहना चाहता हूं, ज्यादा वक्त हाऊस का नहीं लूंगा, कि जनता पार्टी से लेकर आज तक इस व्यक्ति को जितना परेशान वे लोग करना चाहते थे, उन्होंने करने की कोशिश की है, लेकिन उसके बारे में संदेह करना, इससे ज्यादा ज्यादती की बात और कुछ दुनियां में नहीं हो सकती कि इतने वफादार और और लायल आदमी के बारे में कोई आदमी बात करे।

दूसरे मैं इतनी बात कहता हूं कि कुछ लोगों ने जहां तक कह दिया, आप जानते हैं कि कई एसेंब्लियों में तरह-तरह के इल्जाम लगाने की कोशिश की ताकि लोग गुमराह हो सकें। लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके द्वारा सदन से इतनी ही बात कहना चाहता हूं कि जितनी भी ये बातें कही गयी हैं, ये सारी पोलिटिकल हैं। इसका पोलिटिकल लाभ उठाने के लिए कही गयी हैं। यह राजीव गांधी और सरकार के खिलाफ एक बड़ी भारी साज़िश है, लेकिन इनकी साज़िश चलने वाली नहीं है। महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि कोई बात सच्चाई पर ही टिकती है। झूठी बात के पांव तो नहीं होते, वह टिकी नहीं रह सकती यह सारा षड़यंत्र झूठ पर टिका हुआ है, इसलिए यह कामयाब नहीं हो सकता।

महोदय, इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर प्रदान किया।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Now, Mr. Madan Bhatia. You have twenty-five minutes.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): I will try.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): You have to finish because the House has to adjourn today and others have to speak.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the drama which has been enacted by the Opposition in the last fortnight, what has pained and disgusted me the most is the histrionics played by them regarding their feelings and their regard for Mrs. Gandhi.

Sir, if there is one person in this honourable House who knows the extent to which Mrs. Gandhi was humiliated, denigrated and character-assassinated and persecuted, it is I because I was fighting her legal battles from 1977 to 1979. For 17 years, from 1967 till 1984, they did not give her a single moment of peace. They subjected her to the worst possible character-assassination. Between 1977 and 1979, on trumped up charges they sent her to jail. On the same charges they dragged her to the Special Courts. They subjected her to Commissions of Inquiry and they used the instrumentality of the Shah Commission to completely destroy her public image, her reputation, her integrity and her honesty, and most of all, as I said in the morning, they even went to the extent of trying to create and fabricate evidence in order to implicate her in the assassination of Mr. L. N. Mishra. In fact, the honourable Home Minister may take notice of this fact that the files of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Government of India might divulge that material on the basis of which the attempts were made, efforts were made, and the idea was toyed around that she should be implicated and prosecuted on the charge of murder of Mr. L. N. Mishra. And today, Sir, they stand up and say that their hearts are bleeding over the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi, the most heinous crime, and that they want to know the truth. I will ask them only one question. What has been their attitude after the judgement of the Supreme Court under which the truth was discovered? It was upheld by the highest Court of the land as a result of which two persons were convicted and sentenced to death. But did one of them stand up and say that justice and law had their course? On the contrary, they, including important members of the Opposition, tried to create a political atmosphere in this country that the assassin of Mrs. Gandhi was, in fact, a martyr to judicial murder. This was their respect for truth ! They did not desist from casting aspersions on the highest judiciary of the country in order

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

to play their political game. And the hon. Member who also happens to be the counsel for that particular assassin after the handing went to the extent of making a most provocative and sinister statement that Providence may have its revenge. Did any one of them stand up and say that this is an instigative statement to terrorism? They did not. They were hand in glove with this conspiracy to create an atmosphere in the country, as a result of which justice might be perverted and defeated. And today, Sir, they have played and enacted this drama, holding the entire Parliament, to which people of this country look up for debate on their problems and their issues, to ransom. They have dragged democracy in this country into mud.

Sir, so far as Mr. R. K. Dhawan is concerned, history has repeated itself after a period of more than 11 years. I remember the 11th of January, 1978 when Mrs. Gandhi was summoned before the Shah Commission. One day earlier all her objections that she could not be called upon to make a statement before the Commission until she was given an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses who had deposed against her, had been rejected. She knew the consequences. She was fully aware that she was going to be ordered for prosecution by the Shah Commission. On the 11th of January, on that wintry day, she appeared before the Shah Commission, and I had the privilege to be along with her. And I would like to draw the attention of this honourable House to the statement which she made before the Shah Commission before her prosecution was ordered. This is reproduced in the judgment of the Delhi High Court which quashed those proceedings against Mrs. Gandhi, and which I had the privilege to argue almost for four months. She said:

Sir, you know well the mischief of trials by newspapers. The mischief is far greater if the procedure is as one-sided as it has become.

This is unprecedented indeed. The manner in which various people have been encouraged or impelled to come before this Hon'ble Commission and make damaging statements against me is reminiscent of the proceedings before the Parnell Commission. Proceedings of this nature, if I remember right, were described as unique. "The Government has helped them to find their witnesses and so I quote so varied host was never seen in London before."

This was the quotation which she gave from the Parnell Commission. Then, she says:

> "Retired Government servants, cowed down members of the bureaucracy, politicians with flexible consciences and new found courage, suddenly turning crusaders for truth have thought that the path of least resistance was to throw the blame for everything at the door of a former Secretary to the then Prime Minister ..."

And who was that former Secretary to the Prime Minister? It was Mr. R.K. Dhawan, whose unflinching loyalty to Mrs. Gandhi did not desert him, whose courage in spite of the entire harassment, persecution and denigration to which he was subjected by the Janata Government did not fail him. For no rhyme or reason, he, his father, his brother, his cousin were put up in police lock-up for days without bail. His mother could not stand the sufferings of the family and lost her life in November 1977. Indirectly, Mrs. Gandhi, through this statement, paid a tribute to his courage and his loyalty. Mr. Dhawan did not know that this period and this commission was not going to be the first and the last storm in his life. He never realised at that time that in his destiny there was another storm in store for him, a bigger storm in which he would be sought to be implicated in the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi in whose benign presence and affection he had

found the courage and the determination to fight the persecution of the Janata Government. What would this man feel when he receives a letter from the Thakkar Commission saying : "The press reports say that you were very loyal. Please tell me : 'Were you loyal'?" What reply could Mr. Dhawan give? Mr. Dhawan writes back to say : "My loyalty to Mrs. Gandhi does not need demonstrative assertion." It was his modesty and his dignity. The queer inquiry made from him hanged him in the eyes of the Thakkar Commission.

I respectfully submit, Sir, that I would deal with just a few aspects of law. This report violates the terms of reference. It violates the Commissions of Inquiry Act. It violates the rules framed under the Commissions of Inquiry Act and it violates the Constitution of India. The Commissions of Inquiry Act was enacted by Parliament in pursuance of its legislative powers under Entry 94 of the Union List and Entry 45 of the Concurrent List. Both these lists say this "Inquiries". Parliament has got the power to make the law for appointment of commissions for the purpose of conducting inquiry and inquiry alone. It is on the basis of these two entries that the Commissions of Inquiry Act was enacted. Section 3 further says : "A Commission of Inquiry may be appointed by the Government to conduct an inquiry into a matter of definite public importance". Then so far as the Commission is concerned, sub-section 4 says : "The report can be made only as the result of an inquiry and nothing else". This matter was dealt with by Mr. Justice T.P.S. Chawla in the Delhi High Court in the same judgment. I would draw the attention of this hon. House to that particular portion. This is at page 658. It says : "The Commission of Inquiry Act does not envisage the Commission holding any proceeding other than an inquiry. It confers no power to defer the inquiry or to prefix to it some other proceedings". Mr. Palkhivala, who appeared before the Select Committee before this Act was amended, said during the course of his testimony : "Those functions can only be those which are necessary or incidental to inquiry because inquiry into a matter of public importance is the only foundation on which a commission's appointment can rest". And here is a report where Mr. Justice Thakkar says : "I have conducted no inquiry". He says, "I have conducted no investigation because the investigation is to be conducted by the investigating agencies." "What have I conducted?" "I have conducted an exploratory exercise." At another place he says, "I have conducted a pre-inquiry, investigative exercise." I do not have to refer to it because the time is short. But I remember it by heart. He uses three expressions. At one place, he says, "I have conducted an investigative exercise." At another place, he says, "I have conducted an exploratory exercise." At a third place he says, "I have conducted no inquiry under the Act. I have only conducted a pre-inquiry investigative exercise." Who gave him the competence to indulge in such an exercise and make a report on the basis of such an exercise? Under what law did he derive this authority to launch upon an investigative exercise and then make a report as if it is a report under the Act? I respectfully submit, by this fact alone, this report is *non est*. It is physically a jumble of papers, but in the eyes of law it has no validity. Its validity is just as much as the validity of a record of gossips of the ladies in a kitty party. Secondly, Sir, I respectfully submit that he says, "I have not complied with Section 8B of the Act." Now, this is a startling proposition. Section 8B says, "If the Commission decides to conduct an inquiry into the conduct of a person or if the Commission is of the opinion that the reputation of a person is likely to be affected as a result of the inquiry, then he must be given full opportunity of defence under Section 8B—right to cross-examine the witnesses, the right to produce his defence, the right

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

to engage a counsel, the right to have access to the material which is sought to be used against him". But he says, "I have not complied with Section 8B." On his own showing, according to the scheme of this Report, on page 30, he says, "this Report is nothing but an exploratory exercise into one and one individual only, and that is Mr. R.K. Dhawan." He says, "The Commission proposes to adopt the scheme outlined hereinafter first to trace the profile of Mr. Dhawan, then to enumerate indicators distilled from the material gathered which individually or collectively point a finger of suspicion in his direction." From the very word 'go', it was quite obvious to him that he was going to look into the conduct of Mr. R.K. Dhawan. And then on his own showing, in the Report, he says, when he gives the reasons for not making this Report public, that this Report is likely to damage the reputation of the person whose conduct has been inquired into. The Supreme Court says that so far as Section 8B is concerned, the two clauses are that when his conduct is going to be looked into or his reputation is likely to be affected, Section 8B must be complied with. In this case, both the provisions were there. From the word 'go', his conduct was going to be looked into, and from the word 'go', he knew that his reputation is going to be affected. But what does he say at page 29? He says, "I have not conducted any inquiry under Section 8B." Sir, I do not want to waste the time of the House.

5 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND SHARMA) : You have said it.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA : He says, "This report recording its conclusion is based on the pre-inquiry investigative exercise and not on an inquiry under Section 8B of the Commissions of Inquiry Act." Here is a Report presuming that it can be treated as a Report on the basis of an inquiry which completely gives a go-by to section 8B and indicted Mr. Dhawan. This report again, on this ground alone, is a total nullity and it is invalid. It just cannot be looked at. To go into the merits of this report is to give it a legal respectability and authenticity which it is not entitled to have. I would respectfully submit that the Supreme Court has also said so. I raised this point in Mrs. Gandhi's case that reputation is a part of one's personal liberty and no person can be deprived of his reputation except in accordance with the procedure established by law. The procedure established by law is section 8B. Mr. Justice Chawla held that since section 8B had been infringed, it was not necessary for him to decide whether reputation is a part of one's personal liberty or it is not a part of one's personal liberty. In Kiran Bedi's case, the Supreme Court has said that it is a part of one's life, limbs, body, mind and personal liberty. I will read just one particular portion. After quoting some American judgements, the Supreme Court says :

> "The idea expressed is that a man's reputation is a part of himself as his body and limbs are. Reputation is a sort of a right to enjoy the good opinion of others."

It is a part of the body. It is a part of the mind. It is a part of one's limbs. It is a part of a person's very existence in the society. It is a part of personal liberty. By giving a go-by to section 8B, he gives a go-by to article 21 of the Constitution. He infringes the Constitution of India.

Sir, what is the effect when I say it is invalid? In this very judgement it has been said. The proceedings against Mrs. Gandhi were quashed by Mr. Justice T.P.S. Chawla on the very ground that since section 8B had not been complied with, the entire powers and the jurisdiction of the Commission stood vitiated by law. I will just read one particular portion. It says :

"Sections 8B and 8C are rules of

procedure which are founded on the principles of natural justice..."

It goes on:

"If an appropriate authority has committed any violation of the fundamental principles of judicial procedure, that may tend to make the proceedings illegal and void and this infirmity may affect the validity of the order passed by the authority in question. In my opinion, there can be no doubt that sections 8B and 8C are mandatory. One might call them even statutory rules of justice. Since they were not complied with in respect of Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Mukherjee, the very proceedings of the Commission became void and *ultra vires*. The Commission stepped outside its jurisdiction and lost its powers."

Section 8B was given a go-by and still the Commission gives its report! It is a report without power. It is a report without jurisdiction and it just cannot be looked at, in the eyes of the law and factually.

Apart from this, as I have said, he has violated the terms of reference. He has not only violated the terms of reference, he has invented his own terms of reference. What were the terms of reference? They are reproduced on page 3. This is in the final report. It says:

"To hold an enquiry into (a) the sequence of events leading to, and all the facts relating to, the assassination of the late Prime Minister.

(b) whether any person or persons or agents were responsible for conceiving, preparing and planning the assassination and whether there was any conspiracy in this behalf and, if so, all its ramifications."

He had to go into the entire conspiracy of the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi. He had to deal with each and every individual who was involved in this conspiracy. And what does he say? He invents his own terms of reference on page 25. He falsifies the terms of reference. He says: "As enjoined by clause 2(e) of the terms of reference, the Commission is required to explore the issue as regards the possible involvement of persons or agencies other than the accused arraigned before the court." How does he put this rider that his enquiry is to be confined to persons other than those who were really involved in the conspiracy and who are arraigned before the court? Not only that, the hon. Minister has now talked about the larger and bigger conspiracy. In the next paragraph, he says: "It is understood that the Special Investigation Team (SIT) which is in charge of the investigation pertaining to the assassination of the late PM, suspects the involvement of a number of individuals in the conspiracy to commit the crime. It will not be appropriate for the Commission to advert to the material gathered by the SIT in respect of the said suspects." The persons who were arraigned before the court on the charge of conspiracy to assassinate Mrs. Gandhi, he excludes them! The persons who were suspected of conspiracy which is of a bigger dimension, he excludes them! And he picks up Mr. Dhawan from his collar and subjects him to the battery of his judicial assault. Under what terms of reference? He invents his own terms of reference.

In Shah Commission's case, in Mrs. Gandhi's case, there was no term of reference for the Commission to go into the question as to whether the emergency was validly declared or was not validly declared. And yet the Shah Commission launched upon the enquiry into declaration of emergency. On this one ground also, the entire proceedings were quashed because a Commission derives its statutory authority from the terms of reference and nothing else. He cannot depart from the terms of reference. He

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

cannot invent his own terms of reference. This, again I respectfully submit, completely destroys the validity of this particular report.

The last point—and this is most important, Sir—is that it does not give a finding. He says, it is a compilation of my suspicion indicators. This is a remarkable thing. It is the basic established law that when a Commission of Inquiry chooses to look into the conduct of a person, involving him in a criminal offence, the Commission has to base its findings on specific facts which would establish beyond a reasonable doubt the complicity of the man in that offence. It has been held that the degree of proof with regard to the complicity of a man in the commission of an offence, even before the Commission of Inquiry, is no less than the degree of proof required before the trial court. And in this regard, I would repeat what Justice Mathew, another Judge of the Supreme Court wrote, which paragraph was approved by Mr. Justice T.P.S. Chawla in his judgement. This is what he says:

> "It might be that even after the truth of the facts alleged by the prosecution as constituting the offence has been found, the accused would be acquitted in some case on a technical plea, or on the ground that the facts proved do not constitute the offence charge. But this has nothing to do with the truth of the proposition that the first duty of a criminal court is to find truth of facts alleged by the prosecution. It might also be remembered that when the Commission has to enquire into a case and enter findings in respect of an act which amount to a crime, affecting the reputation of a person, the standard of proof required will always be very high. Even in civil proceedings, when a finding has to be made on facts which constitute a criminal offence, the standard of proof is one beyond reasonable doubt as explained by Lord Denning."

And he quotes Lord Denning. Then he quotes a judge of the Supreme Court in Kairon's inquiry in which he said:

> "In evaluating the evidence before it and regulating the proceedings, the Commission had adhered to the time-honoured principle embodied in the Evidence and Code of Procedure, not because they are binding but because they enshrine in themselves the sound and salutary good sense gathered through centuries of experience and wisdom."

then Justice Mathew says:

> "These circumstances would show that there is only minimal difference between the nature of the proceeding before a Commission when the Commission has to enquire into the conduct or matters affecting reputation of a person to which Section 8B is attracted and that of a criminal proceeding in respect of the same subject-matter."

And what does he do? He says there is no evidence. "The matter is to be investigated by the investigating agencies. This is my recommendation. I have my suspicion indicators and my suspicion indicators point the finger against Mr. R.K. Dhawan." Who gave him the authority and the competence and the jurisdiction to write a report like this? Who gave him the authority to make a compilation of suspicion indicators and present them in the form of a report under the Commissions of Inquiry Act?

Lastly, Sir—only two points—as I have said, to go into the merits of this report is to give it legal respectability and

authenticity, which this report is not entitled to. But, nevertheless, I will give only two instances of how this report has falsified the material on record. He says that Mr. R.K. Dhawan declined to face the lie detector test. This, I respectfully submit, is nothing but total falsification of the record. A letter was sent to Mr. Dhawan saying, "Please express your willingness to face the lie detector test." Mr. Dhawan could stand up, on the foundations of law, and ask him, "Under what provisions of the Commissions of Inquiry Act do you have the competence and authority to ask me to face the lie detector test?" Under section 4 of the Act the Commission has got the power to record oral evidence, to receive affidavits or, under section 5, to seek information by means of a communication. It is a statutory body, the powers of which are totally circumscribed by the Commissions of Inquiry Act. He is not a police officer. He is a Commission of Inquiry acting under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. Mr. Dhawan could write back to him and say, "You have no authority to ask me to face the lie detector test." But this is not what Mr. Dhawan says. Mr. Dhawan writes a letter to him—and that is on page 189 of the final report. He says:

> "I shall like to submit that in its letter of February 11, 1985, the Hon'ble Commission did not address any questions to me, but asked for my willingness to 'undergo' the lie detector test. In the circumstances, it was natural for me to request the Hon'ble Commission to let me know the reasons which had prompted the Commission to seek my willingness. For reasons best known to it, the Commission has declined to give the reasons. In the circumstances I hope the Commission will at least furnish to me the following information, as I do not know anything about the 'lie detector test' except that I have heard about it:
>
> (i) The appliances with which it is carried out;
>
> (ii) The manner in which the appliances are operated;
>
> (iii) The mode in which the information is furnished by the appliances;
>
> (iv) The manner in which the information is interpreted;
>
> (v) The human factors involved in the operation of the appliances and the interpretation of the data;
>
> (vi) The expertise required for the operation of the appliances and the interpretation of the data;
>
> (vii) Data relating to the accuracy and reliability of the test;
>
> (viii) The designation or designations of the authorities in charge of operation of these tests in Delhi;
>
> (ix) The location where arrangements for such test have been installed."

He makes these queries. The Commission finds these queries so unanswerable that the Commission dropped the entire subject altogether and further made no request whatsoever to Mr. Dhawan to take the lie-detector test. In the Report the Commission writes: "Mr. Dhawan refused to face the lie-detector test. Therefore, I draw the adverse inference against him that he has something to hide." I can never imagine that about a Commission presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court. God had given to this Commission a position which is very rare to be attained by a citizen of the country. It is a Commission presided over by a Judge of the highest court of the land, and he falsifies the record!

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

One more instance I will give, Sir. I will not take much more time because the time is short. This is at page 71. He says that when Mr. Dhawan was approaching the TMC Gate along with Mrs. Gandhi, before the firing started he fell sufficiently behind which indicates that he knew that the firing was going to take place. This is at page 71. The heading says:

" ...Shri Dhawan had fallen sufficiently behind so that he did not sustain any injury."

After giving this heading, he produces the evidence of two persons who were accompanying Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Dhawan at that particular time. One of them was Shri Nathuram. He reproduced his statement.

"Shri Nathuram: Then PM and Dhawan were talking and going to Akbar Road....Now PM was to reach Akbar Road gate talking to Dhawanji to her left side, I heard sound like that of pataka."

He says, Mr. Dhawan was walking on the left side of Mrs. Gandhi and he was talking to her when he heard a *pataka* sound. Despite this evidence which stares him in the face, he says that Mr. Dhawan fell behind. The Supreme Court has accepted the evidence of Mr. Nathuram. The Supreme Court has accepted the evidence of Mr. Narain Singh on how Mr. Dhawan was walking along with Mrs. Gandhi on her left side and was talking to her when the firing took place. Mr. Nathuram says, he was walking two steps behind Mr. Dhawan. If Mr. Dhawan fell sufficiently behind, he would have struck against Mr. Nathuram and would have dropped him down. This evidence of Mr. Nathuram stares him in the face. He reproduced it. The Supreme Court has accepted this evidence. Despite this, he says that Mr. Dhawan fell sufficiently behind to escape the firing.

The last point, Sir, is this. It is also held by the Supreme Court that if in the course of any enquiry you ignore a material which you ought to have taken into account, so far as these quasi-judicial tribunals are concerned, you lose your jurisdiction.

This Report has played up a changing of time, that the timing was changed from 8-30 to 8-45 or 9-00 o'clock. Very well. After that he says, since this changing of time is mysterious, it must be sinister and must be connected with the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi. The overwrought imagination of the Commission can come to this conclusion. In all fairness the Commission ought to have adverted to this particular fact, namely, the assassins had taken their position of the TMC gate at 7-30 a.m. Now that fact stared in the face. This would have demolished his whole hypothesis. He completely blacks it out from his report.

Sir, I am proud of being Indian. I am the product of that ancient civilisation which threw up the most sublime euphorism viz. *SATYAMEVA JAYATE.* Truth must triumph. My psyche, my bringing up, my culture and the civilisation to which I belong and to which I am beholdened, directs me in one and only one direction, that truth and justice must triumph. If the civilisation of India has withstood the vicissitudes of history of over 2,000 years, it is because it was founded on the pillars of justice and truth. It is justice and truth which have been knocked out in this particular report. I respectfully submit that the Government would have been perfectly competent not to have even acted upon this particular report and ordered the investigation, but because there was assassination of Mrs. Gandhi, the Government accepted its recommendations to conduct an investigation through its own agency. That investigation was conducted over a period of three years. A thorough investigation was carried out on the recommendations of a report which was

totally invalid and which had falsified the record. Then the SIT comes to the conclusion and reports to the Government that so far as Mr. R.K. Dhawan is concerned, he is totally innocent of any suspicion indicators which have been pointed against him in this report of the Thakkar Commission.

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA (Rajasthan): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity of participating in the Thakkar Commission's Report. The report is sharply critical of a number of points such as the security setup, deficiency in intelligence agencies, but the greatest space that it has devoted or rather wasted is concerning Shri. R.K. Dhawan, Special Assistant of late Mrs. Indira Gandhi. It has said that the needle pointed towards Mr. Dhawan. Sir, I have gone through the Report and I would like to mention that its conclusions are arrived at on very flimsy grounds. Frankly speaking I was surprised that a Commission which was presided over by a Supreme Court Judge should have produced such a type of report. For example it mentioned regarding the change of time regarding the TV interview. Mr. Dhawan's explanation is forthright and convincing and as has been established by a number of earlier speakers, change of time made no difference whatsoever as far as the crime was concerned. But I would like to mention that even if the time was changed by Mr. Dhawan, doesn't a Special Assistance have that much of power and prerogative to change the time, if necessary? Dhawan was not only a very able assistant to Mrs. Gandhi, but owing to his ability and merit, he enjoyed a special position of trust and confidence. What was then wrong in case he did change the time for the TV interview? Unfortunately, the Commission sees ghosts where there are no ghosts. The Commission themselves felt that they were not on firm grounds and that is why they have suggested that this is only a preliminary conclusion and that there should be a further investigation by another appropriate authority. This was done and SIT was appointed under Mr. Anand Ram and it has come to the conclusion that there was no hand in the conspiracy as far as Mr. Dhawan is concerned and he was not involved in any way as far as the crime is concerned. Sir, what could be the motive? The Commission themselves got bewildered as far as this concerned. That is why they have said that they could not find any motive as far as Mr. Dhawan's so-called alleged involvement is concerned. Sir, I would very boldly say that where there is no motive, there could not be any involvement in the crime. Only a person with an unbalanced mind or unsound mind, only a mad person or a sadist, only he could perpetrate a crime without motive. No sane person could do that. As far as Mr. Dhawan is concerned, he is intelligent. He worked with a great devotion to Mrs. Gandhi and Indiraji was just like a mother to him. Could there be any motive or could there be his involvement as far as the crime and conspiracy is concerned? My answer, most positive answer is 'No'. Mr. Dhawan had everything to lose by Mrs. Gandhi's defeat. This is not a conjecture but this was a fact and this was the experience. We are talking of 1977 and when the General Elections took place, when Mrs. Gandhi was defeated; it was a defeat not only for Mrs. Indira Gandhi but for all her supporters, for all her

[The Vice Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair.]

people, for all her staff and Dhawan suffered this defeat in silence. His father and his brother were arrested and another brother was demoted. But Mr. Dhawan, who comes from North Western Frontier Province, had a stout heart and he had deep loyalty towards his boss. He stood like a rock. This shows that Dhawan had everything to lose and nothing to gain as far as Mrs. Gandhi's

[Shri Krishna Kumar Birla]

defeat was concerned. After that Mrs. Gandhi's assassination took place. Dhawan was intelligent enough to know that after Mrs. Gandhi's fall his fall would also be there. So, there is no motive. Hence it is preposterous and absurd for the Commission to say that Dhawan was involved in any way or to cast even aspersions as far as his honesty is concerned. I am happy that the SIT has fully exonerated him.

I would only address a few words to my friends in the Opposition. There should be certain matters which should be outside the party purview. Where a question of man's reputation is involved this should be one of those subjects. There is no question of party policy or party decision in such matters. This should really be considered dispassionately on merits. Many of my Opposition friends have confided to me that they are fully convinced that Mr. Dhawan is innocent. In fact, one hon. Member, not very popular with many of us on this side, even gave a Press statement saying that Dhawan was innocent. If that be so, then, why malign an honest person? I hear many stories as to the reason why my friends in the Opposition are after Mr. Dhawan. I would not give much credence to that but all the same it is certainly a point why an innocent person is being unnecessarily harassed. I would say that all these matters should be judged with the yardstick of fairness, equity and truthfulness. I entirely agree with Mr. N.K.P. Salve when he says, as far as history is concerned, Mr. R.K. Dhawan will go down in the history as an honest, forthright person devoted to his boss.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Hon. Members, there are still six or seven speakers and I would request all the members to speak for not more than 20 minutes.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise today to speak on this subject with great anguish. Anguish for one reason that the nation during the last two weeks has been made to relive the trauma and tragedy of the 31st of October, 1984 when its beloved leader was assassinated. The wounds which were healed have been reopened by those who never had any sympathy or demonstrated respect for Indiraji during her lifetime. The previous speakers have explained in detail that those who are showing mock concern and sympathy for Indiraji, those who are today giving an impression as if they are too keenly interested to ascertain the truth about her assassination, their entire conduct and behaviour during her lifetime was not only a behaviour expected from opponents but an inimical behaviour, hostile attitude and by their action during that period, if one cannot accuse them of any complicity, one can certainly say that they were blind to the dimensions of the conspiracy which was at that time active against this country. Sir, in the last two weeks, Parliament has been very effectively hijacked from its real task.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Nobody can hijack.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am saying, Parliament has been effectively hijacked by a motivated Opposition, hijacked in the sense that when we could have sat together and discussed the issues before us, even if there was any genuine, any sincere desire to discuss the Thakkar Commission Report, it was dramatised and every effort was made to give an impression as if the Government was holding back something. There have been acrimonious exchanges in both Houses of Parliament. Bedlam has broken loose in legislatures, slogans have been shouted and preposterous, outrageous statements have been made. Sir, I say so because of what has been happening on this issue and for the last two years what I have witnessed is a very dangerous portent. We have to take cognisance of that

because the people's faith in the institutions is being shakened. The institutions are being denigrated. Nobody can deny that the institutions and the system as such, have taken few serious blows and knocks because of the conduct and behaviour of those who do not have the courage to sit here and listen to the truth. Their absence today proves that they were never interested to find out what the report was. Their only motivation and only consideration was to mislead the people, to create clouds of suspicion and the entire exercise can be termed as a tactical diversion of an Opposition which lacks direction, leadership and programme and which has inherent contradictions and failings. To cover that, they have used this as a tactical diversion and they never wanted to lose that instrument. That is why I have predicted, if you recall, even before the Prime Minister, in his unprecedented gesture, had agreed to table these two reports, that they are not interested in these reports, but they want to keep the issue alive. Even after the reports were tabled—our predictions came true—they came up with more demands, demands for annexures to the report saying that what has been placed here is not the complete report. While making that demand, Sir, they knew that the demand was neither relevant, nor was there any rationale behind it. But they made those demands being aware of the fact that never in the past the annexures, interrogatories and the notices had been placed along with a report.

I do not have even to quote, Sir. But in the final report, Justice Thakkar himself says very clearly that the Commission, as per the terms of reference, had five issues before it; the first three have been dealt with in the interim report and the remainder two in the final report and the interim report read with the final report is the report. Today, in the morning, the Home Minister and the Leader of the House had explained in detail what had happened in the past when such Commissions had been set up. Sir, why is this noise at this juncture? Why is this sudden curiosity on the part of the Opposition to get all the details, all the disclosures? Why is this reveal-all demand? We know that three years back, certain extracts were leaked and published by one magazine, 'India Today', and a newspaper, 'Statesman'. Then nobody reacted. There was no response. There was no demand. But today, suddenly, they all have woken up. There could be only two reasons, Sir. One is the lengthening shadow of the forthcoming general elections and the other is the return of R. K. Dhawan which has rattled both the turn-coats and the opportunists and the Opposition which is aware that he can see through their sinister designs and his very presence, somehow, has rattled and scared them.

When we talk of this report, Sir, I do not want to go into the details as to why it was not tabled earlier. It has been discussed. But Parliament agreed that it was consensus decision to withhold it them given the interests of the on-going criminal investigations and the cogent reasons which Justice Thakkar himself had propounded. More than that, there were other sensitive issues involved because this Commission was to inquire into the assassination of the late Prime Minister. It was also to go into the functioning of the security agencies, the intelligence agencies; not only the dereliction of duty on the part of Officers but the *modus operandi* of the intelligence agencies—the possibility of involvement of foreign agencies or other countries in the entire conspiracy. Now, who says that this particular aspect of the record is not sensitive or has no direct bearing on the nation's security? If anybody says that the records which pertain to the lapses or the loopholes in the security set-up of the Prime Minister, in the follow-up action which deals with the boosting of the security or the

[Shri Anand Sharma]

strengthening of the security, have nothing to do with the nation's security, has no direct bearing on it, in the light of what we have experienced in the past, in the assassination of a Prime Minister, then, I will only say that such people are not blind to realities. But they have no interest in the security of this country. Why do I say so, Sir? Why is this Satanic curiosity? Who is interested to know what steps have been taken by this date to guard the person of the Prime Minister? Certainly, I am not interested to know. I only want to be assured that he is protected well and the lapses which were there is the case of Mrs. Gandhi's security set-up have been covered effectively. But who benefits from this information? Those who want to go in for another exercise of destabilization and those who want to plunge this country again into chaos and anarchy. Sir, I say this with all responsibility, because those who show more concern about these things were the ones who, when the security set-up was strengthened, repeatedly said that there was no need for any heavy security and they questioned the high cost of the security and they expressed their views through their popular paper, the "Indian Express", against the security set-up of the Prime Minister and tried to influence the people through regular cartoons, write-ups, whereas, even in this Report which we are discussing, Mr. Thakkar himself says that no cost is high enough to protect the person of the nation's chosen leader. So, this makes it clear as to what the motivation is....*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Let there be no talk, please. Mr. Sharma is speaking and let there be no disturbance.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: As I was saying, the Opposition which has questioned the sensitivity of the Reports or the documents which have been withheld has done it to ensure that everything comes out. Their behaviour bears their true intentions.

As far as this Commission's Report is concerned, without going into details, into which both the Minister of State and Mr. Madan Bhatia have gone, I will only say that this Report is based purely on conjectures and surmises. I find a strange obsession with, a strange focus on, one person and that is Mr. R.K. Dhawan, and I find very little devotion to the larger dimension to the graver dimension of the involvement of foreign agencies of foreign powers. Here, we have a report, which is not even based on an inquiry conducted under rule 8(B) of the Commissions of Inquiry Act which, as per Mr. Justice Thakkar himself, is a pre-inquiry investigative exercise, and which indicts a person on the flimsiest of flimsy charges.

This Report, Sir, in fact, points its needle of suspicion merely on the basis of changes of timings for the filming by the Irish TV team or the reposting four months before the assassination of the Sikh security personnel or the so-called statements about Mrs. Gandhi having taken a decision in 1982 to remove Mr. R.K. Dhawan and, as a person knowing her mind, Sir, I will only say that she would not have waited for two years, she would not have waited for two-and-a-half years to remove him and M. Justice Thakkar has conveniently ignored the fact that in 1983 July, the then Principal Secretary had very strongly recommended his promotion to the position of Joint Secretary which was confirmed by the Government. So, there is a grave contradiction. This means that the facts have been overlooked deliberately. Why? Was Mr. R.K. Dhawan responsible for giving the choice of position to the assassin, Beant Singh, at the TMC Gate? Again, was he responsible for changing the time to two in the after-noon from seven in the morning? Was he responsible for permitting Satwant Singh to go there? Only because R.K. Dhawan

himself did not received a bullet, the needle of suspicion has been deliberately twisted. This report, Justice Thakkar has himself said, is not even admissible as evidence; it will not stand a judicial scrutiny in any court of law. And I leave it at that. But here I only say that Justice Thakkar says that the Commission cannot hold a parallel trial. But actually it has done so. It is virtually hanging a loyal person, a man of integrity, without any basis or evidence. Not only that, Sir. What the Opposition and the media have done in whipping up a campaign based on this report goes against the very basic principles of natural justice. No man is to be considered guilty unless and until proven otherwise beyond the shadow of any reasonable doubt. That is the basic principle of natural justice. and what has happened here? Both what the media has been doing and what the Opposition has been doing is entirely contrary to that. R.K. Dhawan certainly does not require a certificate from any of us. He is not on trial. And not from those who have a murky track record of their own. Or, from the political turncoats, whom I want to refer here, Sir. Those who were in this Government, people like Vishwanath Pratap Singh, people like Asoke Sen who was then the Law Minister or the then Minister of Internal Security, Arun Nehru, today are the Messiahs of the Opposition. That also betrays the bankruptcy of Indian Opposition which never has any political leader. The moment one is thrown out of the Congress Party he becomes their godfather and their leader. But these worthies were in the Government, enjoyed power and they were privy and party to all the decisions of the Government of India. Today, Vishwanath Pratap Singh turns around and says—and with what audacity? — "I never read the report". And Asoke Sen says the same thing. It is for the nation to judge and for this House to judge. I am placing my views on record about the character of these people. Did they have their scruples in their pockets then? Did they mortagage their consciences? If not then, then today they have certainly mortgaged their consciences, because there were certain persons, these forces, which wanted to grab somehow power in this country. They were keen to remove the obstacle in the form of a person who had 22 years of rich experience of working with Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Not only to remove him but then to frame him.

You just ponder for a moment again on another trait of these forces. Then they go to that very person, whom they had tried to destroy, and tried to win him over, to join forces against Rajiv Gandhi. He had refused to buckle under pressure. Again, he refused. And his refusal upset them and has rattled them. And they have started leaking the stolen extracts of the reports. It is a different matter that the Opposition says today that even if the Government does not give them all the documents, the newspapers, particularly one paper, has the extracts of the documents.

Sir, here I would like to demand from the Government a proper investigation into this leak, the identification of the culprits and exemplary punishment because this nation cannot survive if trecherous individuals thriving on theft and if newspapers surviving on stolen documents are eulogised and praised. We must put a stop to it.

Sir, I have just one important thing to add and that is about the conspiracy aspect and the sequence of events during the last one decade. Sir, when Pakistan was ruled by General Zia-ul-Haq, at that time, there was a very active and hostile move against this country. Disaffection was created amongst a section of our people, amongst the Sikhs in Punjab, if I have to mention it specifically. Hostile propaganda was mounted against this country from across our borders supported by powerful sections of the western media. Terrorist training camps were set up. Arms were freely given. Far

[Shri Anand Sharma]

away, even in America - of course, it is closed now, I have not forgotten the existence of campus training schools. It is not a coincidence that some leaders of our Opposition had very close friendship with General Zia. They accepted his invitations, went to Pakistan and accepted his gifts. That relationship with General Zia of the Indian Opposition leaders at that juncutre, when Indiraji was constantly warning the countrymen of the conspiracy to dismember India, cannot be ignored or brushed aside. It was not a coincidence. General Zia is friendly with Mr. Jagjit Singh Chauhan and Jagga Singh Dhillon. General Zia is supplying arms to the Killers. Jagjit Singh Chauhan is broadcasting over the B.B.C exhortations to assassinate Indira Gandhi and here Biju Patnaik and George Fernandes become the State guests of General Zia-ul-Haq. What was it? I want to know that. They were giving virtually a clean chit to Zia-ul-Haq and weakening our own case before the international community. At that crucial time, they were enhancing the credibility of a person whose actions were hostile to this country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I am concluding, Sir. I want to quote a senior leader of the opposition who, at that time, had said that there was no threat to India.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया (बिहार): नाम बताइये।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई): नाम बताने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: He said that there was no threat to India either from outside or from inside. If there is any threat to India, it is from Indira Gandhi. Such statements were made at that time. It is shameful and disgraceful. Sir, it was again not a coincidence that when all this was happening, there was a study commission in the United States of America by Prof. Hardgrave. What was the topic and what were the conclusions of this report? It was about the impact of the sudden disappearance of Shrimati Indira Gandhi from the scene and the outcome of an election or the Congress prospects in the event of sudden death of Indira Gandhi. She was alive and healthy then. She was not suffering from any disease. This study was conducted four months before her assassination. What I am pointing to is that it has a linkage with what we find today. Shrimati Indira Gandhi was assassinated, the nation lost its Prime Minister and the subsequent conduct of the Opposition is equally revealing. They shed some crocodile tears and immediately after that they changed their stance. They started spreading rumours in the country, rumours that "the Government is soft on the killers, the Government is not taking action, etc." at that time when the trial was going on in the courts of law. When the killers were convicted by the court of law, and the verdict was upheld by the highest courts of the land, the same newspaper which is doing the mischief today ran a parallel campaign against the judicial process, and all the Opposition leaders overnight developed an intriguing sympathy for the assassins, demanding pardon for them. Can they explain their conduct? And now they want to know all the details, all the sensitive material. They want the files to be placed before them. And today they were saying that they have the right credentials. I have my doubts.

This exercise of today has a clear linkage with what has happened in the past. And I would like to remind this House of a historical fact and one bitter experience of ours also that a political assassination is always followed by a physical elimination. Any assassination in history of political leaders has been preceded by smear campaigns. We have

seen it in the case of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. History is full of such instances. We cannot allow this hate campaign to continue. What we have witnessed in this House and outside the House and through the writings of the media is the mounting of a fresh hate campaign. I am very sad to point it out. It is not even five years and the conspirators are back with a vengeance. They, the Members of the Opposition, today have the audacity to question the sincerity of the Government of Rajiv Gandhi to ascertain the truth about the assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi and to punish the guilty. I only say, Sir, that in her death, the nation lost the Prime Minister and it was the gravest personal loss for the present Prime Minister, a grave targedy. And he rose above that to give a healing touch to the nation, a direction to the nation. He never swore vengeance, but allowed the law to take its own course. But the sincerity of this Government cannot be questioned by those whom I only describe as confirmed enemies of Mrs. Indira Gandhi during her life time, her tormentors. They cannot question the sincerity of this Government.

I conclude by saying, Sir, that in this present self-created tumult and noise, we all, including the Opposition, are a part of a historical process and the posterity has to judge all our actions. They will judge the conduct and the behaviour of the Opposition and their despicable attempts to derive political capital out of the assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, to politicise her assassination to denigrate the Government. And it is important that we all stand up, we wake up to the danger, to the fresh dimension of a conspiracy, and hit back to expose the forces responsible for this hate campaign. Thank you, very much, Sir.

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग (गुजरात): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर ...**(व्यवधान)**।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Those who have spoken should also listen to others, and should not leave the House

6.00 P.M.

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग: उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट पर अपने विचार प्रस्तुत करने से पहले मैं आपके माध्यम से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि यह खेद की बात है और कई बार सदन में कही जा चुकी है और मैं मांग करूंगा कि अभी तक भी ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट राजभाषा में प्रस्तुत नहीं की गई। इसको गंभीरतापूर्वक लें और आइंदा ऐसा न हो। इसका ख्याल रहे। मुझे अत्यन्त खेद, दुख और आश्चर्य है कि देश का विपक्ष आज जितना पथ-भ्रष्ट, दृष्टि-विहीन और गैर-जिम्मेदार है इतना इससे पूर्व कभी नहीं रहा। मान्यवर, इसे मैं इस महान देश का दुर्भाग्य समझता हूं अनैतिक धरातल पर सिर्फ राजनैतिक और सत्ता समर्पित उन्मुक्तता ही जिसने अपना परम लक्ष्य बनाया है ऐसे विपक्ष से मूल्यों की अपेक्षा करना आकाश चुंबन की चेष्टा के सिवाय और कुछ भी नहीं है। मान्यवर, आज बासी कढ़ी में फिर उबाल आया है। ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट का आधार लेकर विपक्ष आज राजनैतिक लाभ लेना चाहता है। देश के लोगों के समक्ष अपनी अच्छी छवि बनाने का कोई आधार देश के विपक्ष के पास नहीं हैं। उनके पास कोई नैतिक, आर्थिक, राष्ट्रीय या सामाजिक योगदान का कोई आधार नहीं है। इसलिये मान्यवर, ऐसे सुल्लक आधारों का सहारा लेकर वह देश के मतदाताओं को भ्रमित करना चाहता है। मान्यवर, ठक्कर रिपोर्ट 19.11.85 को और उसकी अंतिम रिपोर्ट 27.2.86 को सरकार को प्रस्तुत की गई और मान्यवर, आज का समय है। 1989 और अप्रैल महीना। इस लम्बे अर्से में आज तक इस पर कुछ नहीं कहा गया, आज तक इस बारे में कोई बात नहीं कही गई। लेकिन आज अचानक मान्यवर, विपक्ष नींद में से जागकर जिसको रिपोर्ट का हिस्सा नहीं माना गया है, ऐसे कागजातों को, जो कि प्रोसीडिंग्स के कागजात के अलावा कुछ नहीं हैं, उनको सदन में प्रस्तुत करने की मांग कर रहा है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई): मीर्जा जी इस पर बहुत बहस हो गई है। यू कैन लीव दिस प्वांइट।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग: मानयवर, संसद में रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत न करने के संबंध में जब संशोधन पारित किया गया था तब भी मान्यवर, विपक्ष चुप रहा और उसने कोई बावेला नहीं मचाया। विपक्ष केवल अनैतिक ही

[श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग]

नहीं बल्कि असंवैधानिक प्रश्न उठाकर अपने गैर जिम्मेदाराना और अलोकतांत्रिक स्वभाव का परिचय दे रहा है। मान्यवर, महान राष्ट्रीय नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या की जांच करने के लिये ठक्कर कमीशन बनाया गया और कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी एक्ट के अन्तर्गत जिसके टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस के पांच मुद्दे तय किये गये थे। मान्यवर, पहले तीन मुद्दों के संबंध में अंतरिम रिपोर्ट दी गई और बाकी के जो दो मुद्दे थे उनके संबंध में अंतिम रिपोर्ट बाद में प्रतुत की गई और इसे एज इट इज संसद में रखा गया। इसलिये यह दलील कि रिपोर्ट का एक हिस्सा छिपाया जा रहा है यह सम्पूर्ण गलत और अनर्गल झूठ के सिवाय कुछ भी नहीं है। मान्यवर, ठक्कर कमीशन की प्रोसीडिंग्स से संबंधित कुछ ऐसे दस्तावेज हैं जो कि टाप सीक्रेट हैं और जिनको सार्वजनिक करने से इंटेलीजेंस एजेंसियों के कार्य पर गलत असर पड़ सकता है। मान्यवर, इस कमीशन को कितने ही ऐसी गोपनीय सूचनायें प्रतिज्ञाओं के आधार पर गोपनीय स्वरूप में, वैयक्तिक स्वरूप में दी गई होंगी जिनको सार्वजनिक कैसे किया जा सकता है? मान्यवर, कुछ ऐसे आधार भी हो सकते हैं जो कांस्पिरेसी केस के आधार को कमजोर कर सकते हैं। मान्यवर, इसको सार्वजनिक करार देने की अनुमति कैसे मिल सकती है? न कोई ऐसा कानून है और न कोई ऐसी परंपरा है कि प्रोसीडिंग्स को रिपोर्ट का हिस्सा मानकर संसद में पेश किया जाय। मान्यवर, जनता सरकार ने शाह कमीशन बनाया, नागरवाला केस में रेड्डी कमीशन बनाया गया, क्या उनकी रिपोर्ट के साथ प्रोसीडिंग्स रखी थी? मान्यवर, मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि शाह कमीशन की प्रोसीडिंग्स क्या रखी गई थी इस सदन में? गांधी जी की हत्या की रिपोर्ट, नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस की रिपोर्ट, दीन दयाल उपाध्याय की रिपोर्ट, क्या किसी भी रिपोर्ट के साथ प्रोसीडिंग्स रखी गई थी? मान्यवर, यह न तो कोई प्रैक्टिस है, न कोई परंपरा है कि प्रोसीडिंग्स को रिपोर्ट का हिस्सा माना जाय या इसे ऐसा समझकर संसद में पेश किया जाय। मान्यवर, मैं तो गांव से आता हूं इसलिए एक सरसरी दलील दे देना चाहता हूं। मान्यवर, दर्जी को अगर कपड़ा दे दिया जाय और उससे कह दिया जाय कि एक पैंट और एक शर्ट तैयार कर दो, वह कहेगा कि इतने मीटर कपड़ा ले आइये। मैंने उसको कपड़ा दे दिया और कहा कि इस नाप से हमको यह बनाकर दे दीजिए। अब कपड़ा दर्जी ने बना कर के हम को दे दिया तो उज्र इस बात पर नहीं है कपड़ा ठीक सिला है या नहीं उज्र यह है कि कपड़े की कतरन जो है वह वापस कर दें और यह कतरन मांगने का ही सवाल है जो हमारे विपक्ष के लोग मांग कर रहे हैं । उनको कपड़े से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, न उसकी मेज़रमेंट से सम्बन्ध है, न उसकी सिलाई से कोई सम्बन्ध है। यह एक साफ दलील है कि जिन तथ्यों के आधार पर यह आयोग बैठाया गया था उसके जो टर्म्स आफ रेफ्रेंस थे उनके आधार पर अगर सम्पूर्ण रिपोर्ट दी गई है तो क्या इसके तथ्यों के आधार पर बहस नहीं हो सकती है? मान्यवर, क्योंकि इनकी दृष्टि छोटी है इसलिए उनका विश्वास सिर्फ कतरन में है। घोर आश्चर्य यह है कि विपक्ष जो के है इन्दिरा जी समग्र जीवन में इन्दिरा जी को परेशान करने, उनको बदनाम करने और यहां तक कि उन्हें नेस्तोनाबूद करने का घिनौना प्रयास करता रहा था। उनकी हत्या के बारे में राजीव गाँधी से अधिक और कांग्रेस पार्टी से अधिक आज इतनी चिन्ता उनको हो गई है । मान्यवर, यह तो घड़ियाल के आंसू हैं। जैसे कि आनन्द शर्मा जी कह रहे थे कि जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज़ और बीजू पटनायक ने 1984 में पाकिस्तान का दौरा कर के जनरल ज़िया के मेहमान-नवाज़ी स्वीकार कर के भारत की अस्मिता का सौदा करने का काम किया और जनरल ज़िया द्वारा जो भारत में आतंकवादियों को सहायता दी जा रही थी उसके बारे में उन से एक भी शब्द नहीं कहा। मान्यवर, ठक्कर कमीशन की कई बातें मेरी समझ में नहीं आई मैं कोई बड़ा न्यायविद् नहीं हूं, मान्यवर बार बार घुमा-फिरा कर बावेला मचाते हैं, बार-बार आर०के० धवन का नाम लेते हैं, यह मेरी समझ मे नहीं आता कि जिस ढंग से आर०के० धवन पर प्रोसीडिंग्स इस रिपोर्ट में हैं कि पीटर उस्तीनोव टी०वी० टीम का समय बदले जाने के सम्बन्ध में जिस तरह से धवन पर कैमरा घुमाया गया है मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है जब सतवंत सिंह और बेअन्त सिंह हत्या के दिवस 31-10-84 को ड्यूटी पर थे, सुबह सात बजे से 10 बजे तक वे ड्युटी पर रहने वाले थे, तो फिर टी०वी० टीम का समय आठ बजे हो या साढ़े आठ बजे हो या नौ बजे हो मैं समझता हूं कि यह अधिक कानूनी महत्व

का मुद्दा नहीं हो सकता है। इसी बात को लेकर देश का विपक्ष धवन पर टूट पड़ा है। यह सिर्फ राजनीति से प्रेरित है क्योंकि श्री धवन श्री राजीव गांधी के नाम से जुड़े हुए हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई): मगर विपक्ष का धवन के बारे में ऐसा मानना है क्या?

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: विपक्ष ने ऐसा कभी नहीं कहा **(व्यवधान)**

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: आप विपक्ष में हैं क्या? **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग: आप उनके प्रवक्ता बन कर बोल रहे हैं क्या? मान्यवर, अखबारों में आया है **(व्यवधान)** मेहता जी अगर आप विपक्ष के प्रवक्ता हैं तो ठीक बात है **(व्यवधान)**

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मानयीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं सदन के नेता से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या माननीय सदस्य कांग्रेस में हैं या नहीं?

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग: मान्यवर, इनका सिर्फ एक ही लक्ष्य है **(व्यवधान)**

श्री चिमनभाई मेहता: पार्टी में भी अपोजीशन हो सकता है। **(व्यवधान)**

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग: मान्यवर, राजीव गाँधी को लोकतान्त्रिक ढंग से तो यह हटा नहीं सकते क्योंकि लोकतान्त्रिक ढंग से लोगों का समग्र विश्वास राजीव गांधी में प्रस्थापित है, और आज भी यह विश्वास है, लेकिन उनको अपने आप में विश्वास नहीं है कि आने वाले दिनों में देश की जनता उन पर विश्वास रखेगी या नहीं। इसलिए राजीव गांधी के साथ जितनी चीजें जुड़ी हुई हैं उनके साथ में उनका संशय है। यही कारण है कि आज अखबारों में धवन की बात को ले कर, कि उन्होंने इस तरह से टाइम बदल दिया, इसलिए उन पर संशय है, यह बात ले कर आज विपक्ष चल रहा है। कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी एक्ट के अधीन होता है जब कि क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड के अन्तर्गत यह हाई कोर्ट में या और कोर्टों में जा सकते हैं।

और मान्यवर, इन्हीं कानूनों के अंतर्गत एक स्पेशल इन्वेस्टीगेटिव टीम बनायी गयी जिसने सभी संदर्भों की तलाश करके श्री धवन को उसके अन्दर बिल्कुल साफ बताया, उनका उसमें इन्वाल्वमेंट उन्होंने नहीं बताया। मान्यवर, विपक्ष के लिये जो बात वे समझते हैं, मानते हैं, वहीं बात कही जाये तो सच है अन्यथा बिल्कुल गलत है। उनके भान वाली जो बात है वह सच और बाकी जो कुछ कहें वह उनको गलत बात लगती है। मान्यवर, अटार्नी जनरल ने अपना जो औपीनियन दिया है उस में भी उनका विश्वास नहीं रह पाया । अटार्नी जनरल न तो कांग्रेस के इन्सान हैं, न आपके इन्सान हैं, वे तो एक स्वायत्त संस्था हैं। उस इन्सान ने, एक निष्पक्ष इन्सान ने अगर अपने को व्यक्त किया- और अटार्नी-जनरल कोई फुटपाथ पर से लेकर तो नहीं बैठाये जाते हैं, देश के कानून को अच्छे ढंग से समझने वाले जो सर्वोच्च व्यक्ति हैं उनको ही उस स्थान पर बैठाया जाता है - उनकी ओपीनियन पर भी विश्वास नहीं है। उन्होंने विश्वास दिलाया और जो ओपीनियन दिया उस ओपीनियन को भी आज उन्होंने नहीं माना। मान्यवर, उन्होंने अपनी साफ ओपीनियन दी कि कमीशन की जो रिपोर्ट दी गयी है उस रिपोर्ट के अन्दर प्रोसीडिंग्स शामिल नहीं है, यह न माना जाये कि यह रिपोर्ट का हिस्सा है, लेकिन उन्होंने इस ओपीनियन को इसलिये नहीं माना कि उनकी राजनीति अलग है।

मान्यवर, जुडीशियरी ने इंदिराजी के हत्यारों को फांसी दी। मान्यवर, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ आपके माध्यम से कि जहां ये जुडीशियरी की बात करते हैं तो उस दिन भी जुडिशियरी के जजमेंट को क्रिटिसाइज किसने किया । मान्यवर, इसी जनता दल के लोगों, जनता दल के राम जेठमलानी, जनता दल के रामकृष्ण हेगड़े, जार्ज फर्नेन्डीस, श्री शांति भूषण और कई लोगों ने इस जजमेंट को क्रिटिसाइज किया। मान्यवर, आज यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि ऐसे कुछ व्यक्तियों के कारण, ऐसा ही विपक्ष का जो मानस चल रहा है उसके कारण इंदिरा गांधी जी के हत्यारों की वकालत करने वाले लोगों के लिये आज देश के प्रजातंत्र का सर्वोच्च द्वार जो था वह द्वार जनता दल ने खोल दिया। देश का इससे बड़ा दुर्भाग्य कोई हो नहीं सकता कि राम जेठमलानी जैसे व्यक्ति को आज इस सदन में आने के लिये उन्होंने अपना द्वार खोल दिया। मान्यवर, कम से कम कोई लेविल तो हमारा होना चाहिए , डेमोक्रेसी में कोई लेविल तो होना चाहिए, आचार संहिता भी तो कोई वस्तु होती है। कम से कम यह तो देखते कि इंदिरा गांधी जी सिर्फ

[श्री मीर्जा इशादबेग]

देश की प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं थी, इंदिरा गांधी जी सिर्फ एक पार्टी की नेता नहीं थी, इंदिरा गान्धी जी देश के जन जन में, देश के जन जन के मानस में बैठी हुए एक ऐसी महान व्यक्ति थी जो उनके दिलों में राज करती थी, एक महान फ्रीडम फाइटर थीं, एक महानतम व्यक्ति थीं, देश के सेक्युलरिज्म के लिये, देश के लोकतांत्रिक आधार के लिये, देश की सुरक्षा के लिये, देश की आजादी के लिये जिनके दिल में जितनी भावना थी, मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि और जो हमारे महान नेता हुए हैं उनसे कोई कम भावना उनके दिल में थी, कम से कम ऐसे व्यक्ति के हत्यारों के बारे में , ऐसे व्यक्ति की हत्यारों की वकालत करने में तुम्हे शर्म भी नहीं आती है, और मान्यवर, इससे बड़ी शर्म की बात क्या हो सकती है कि इंदिरा गान्धी जी के बाजू में जो लोग बैठे थे, जो लोग इंदिरा गान्धी के साथ कैबिनेट में बैठे थे वे ही बैठकर ऐसे व्यक्तियों को यहां पर लाने की ऐसी घिनौनी चेष्टा कर रहे हैं। इससे ज्यादा दुर्भाग्य, मान्यवर, इस देश का और नहीं हो सकता है, मान्यवर, इसे देश कभी माफ नहीं करेगा। मान्यवर, मैं आपके माध्यम से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि स्मगलरों की वकालत करने वाले लोग, यहां लाते हैं ये लोग। इतना ही नहीं, मान्यवर, उनको अपना सर्वोच्च समझते हैं जिनको हमने यहां से निष्कासित किया और वे अपना चुनाव भी लड़ते हैं तो तस्करों के पैसे से लड़ते हैं तथा बात करते हैं देश में लोकतांत्रिक मूल्यों की स्थापना करने की , बात करते हैं हम देश को एक अच्छा तंत्र देंगे, एक अच्छा एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन देंगे। मान्यवर, जिनके हाथ इंदिरा गांधी जी के खून से रंगे हुए है, जिनके हाथ महात्मा गांधी जी के खून से रंगे हुए हैं, जिनके दिलों में अगर भावना है तो तस्करों को आगे ले जाने की भावना है, जिनके दिलों में अगर कोई भावना है तो सत्ता की कुर्सी को कैसे हासिल किया जाये , यह भावना है, वे देश को क्या आगे ले जायेंगे। और यही डर तो उन्हें खाये जा रहा है। इसलिये आर०के०धवन आए, तो आर० के० धवन और राजीव गांधी के साथ कांग्रेस पार्टी के साथ जो भी लोग जुड़े हुए है, उन लोगों का कैसे करेक्टर असैसिनेशन किया जाए, कैसे उनको देश के लोगों सामने खराब बताया जाए, यहां साजिश, षडयंत्र आज चला रहे हैं।

लेकिन मुझे आशा है कि इस देश में आज भी गांधी जी के दिये हुए मूल्य प्रस्थापित हैं और वह महान आत्मा, वह देश का महान व्यक्ति और मानव कुछ ही ऐसे लोग होते है कि जिनको यह पता हो जाता है कि आने वाले दिनों में क्या होने वाला है।

मान्यवर, आपके माध्यम से मैं देश को याद करवाता हूं वह शब्द जो इंदिरा गांधी ने मरने से पूर्व बोले है, याद दिलाता हूं, मान्यवर देश की जनता को कि देखो यह नेता कौनसी नेता थी, इस नेता के दिल में क्या भावना थी? देश का स्वाभिमान देश की सेवा और देश को आगे ले जाने की भावना उसके दिल में कितना ठूंस-ठूंस कर भरी थी। याद करें उस महान आत्मा को, याद करें उस महान नेता इंदिरा गांधी को, उसने भुवनेश्वर में लोगों के बीच में जाकर जन-जन में कहा था, उस दिन जन-सभा को संबोधित करते हुए इंदिरा गांधी कहती हैं कि:

> "मुझे चिंता नहीं कि मैं जीवित रहूं या नहीं। जब तक मुझ में सांस है, तब तक मैं सेवा करती रहूंगी और जब भी मेरी जान जाएगी, मेरे खून का एक-एक कतरा भारत को मजबूती देगा और अखंड भारत को जीवित रखेगा।"

मान्यवर, याद करें वह कुर्बानी, याद करें उस महान व्यक्ति के शब्द कि भारत को जीवित रखने के लिये उसने यह कहा कि मुझे परवाह नहीं है, कल अगर मेरी जान जायेगी, लेकिन मेरी अगर जान जाएगी, मेरे जिस्म से जो भी खून के कतरे गिरेंगे, तो एक-एक कतरा इसका सबूत देगा, एक-एक कतरे से यह आवाज गूंजेगी कि यह हिंदुस्तान मेरा हिंदुस्तान है, इस हिंदुस्तान की आजादी मैंने अपने प्राणों से ज्यादा समझ कर उसकी रक्षा की है और मेरी जिंदगी उसमें बर्बाद हुई है और मैंने अपनी जिंदगी उसमें फनाह की है और मेरी अगर मृत्यु भी हुई है, मेरी अगर मौत भी हुई है, तो इस देश की आजादी को जीवित करने के लिये, इस देश की एक बिन -सांप्रदायिक परंपराओं को स्थापित करने के लिये यहां आज मैं जीवित हूं।

मान्यवर, इंदिरा गांधी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट कह रही है, आज यह मानव कह रहे हैं कि इंदिरा गांधी के दिल में बिन-सांप्रदायिकता की भावना कितनी थी। कह दिया गया कि सिख कम्यूनिटी के लोगों को हटा दें। इंदिरा गांधी फौरन कहती है कि यह कभी नहीं हो सकता है और, मान्यवर, इस देश में अगर ऐसे शब्द कोई प्रधान मंत्री बोल सकता है, तो वह इंदिरा गांधी फेमिली का इन्सान ही बोल सकता है कि इस देश में चाहे मेरी जान जाए, उसकी परवाह नहीं है, लेकिन यहां पर सांप्रदायिक भावना के आधार पर कोई कार्य नहीं होगा। देश का भावना के आधार पर कोई कार्य नहीं होगा। देश का

सलाम है ऐसे महामना को, देश ऐसे व्यक्तियों को सलाम करता है और देश अगर आज जीवित है, तो ऐसे व्यक्तियों की कुर्बानियों के कारण ही जीवित है और उसी व्यक्ति का बेटा, इंदिरा गांधी के बेटे होने के नाते से राजीव गांधी आज देश के प्रधान मंत्री के आसन पर स्थापित नहीं, लेकिन देश के लोगों के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों ने अपना विश्वास प्रस्थापित किया है इस व्यक्ति में और लोकतांत्रिक ढंग से उनको प्रधान मंत्री चुना है और देश ने देखा है, विदेशों ने देखा है और विश्व ने देखा है कि जिस दिन से राजीव गांधी ने इस देश के तंत्र को संभाला है, इस देश के विश्वास को, इस देश की आभा को और इस देश की समृद्धि को और उससे भी अधिक यह कहिए कि इस देश के स्वाभिमान को समग्र विश्व फलक पर कहां उसने पहुंचाया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई): अब आप समाप्त करिए।

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग : मान्यवर, मैं दो मिनट में खत्म करूंगा। इसलिए मान्यवर, मैं चाहूंगा इंदिरा जी ने अपने जीवनकाल में कहा और ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट भी यह कहती है, उसने जब यह कहा, इंदिरा गांधी ने कई बार कहा कि इस मुल्क को तोड़ने के लिए, इस मुल्क को कमजोर करने के लिए, कई विदेशी ताकतें अपना पंजा फैला करके अपनी संपूर्ण कोशिश कर रही हैं। जिस दिन इंदिरा गांधी ने इस बात को कहा, यही विपक्ष के लोग हैं जिन्होंने इंदिरा गांधी का मखौल उड़ाया। मैं कहता हूं यहां बैठे है चिदम्बरम् जी, जल्दी से उन तथ्यों को देश की जनता के सम्मुख रख दीजिए कि कांपिरेसी क्या थी, कौन लोग उसके अन्दर शामिल थे और जिस दिन यह तथ्य देश के सामने आ जायेंगे उस दिन उनके पैर के नीचे की धरती हिल जाएगी। जब इंदिरा गांधी ने इस बात को बताया तब इसका मजाक उड़ाया और आज राजीव गांधी जी इस बात को कह रहे हैं तो उसका मजाक उड़ाया जा रहा है क्योंकि तथ्य उन्हें मालूम नहीं है। सच्चाई उन्हें मालूम नहीं है। इसलिए मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से मांग करता हूं कि ऐसी जो ताकतें हैं, ऐसे जो तत्व हैं, चाहें कहीं बैठे हों चाहे किसी उच्च आसन पर बैठे हो, लेकिन देश की एकता के साथ खिलवाड़ करने वाले कोई व्यक्ति, देश की आजादी और सुरक्षा के साथ खेल करने वाला कोई व्यक्ति अगर कहीं पर बैठा हो, बड़े सख्त हाथों से उसके सामने कदम लिए जाएं। एक बार हम राष्ट्रपिता को खो चुके है, एक बार हम प्रधान मंत्री को खो चुके हैं, अब देश में वह शक्ति नहीं रही है कि हम ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति को खो सकें। ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति को खोने की शक्ति अब देश में नहीं रही है।

मैं आशा और विश्वास करता हूं, मान्यवर कि मेरी सरकार प्रजातांत्रिक मूल्यों में विश्वास रखती है, राजीव गांधी की सरकार बिन सांप्रदायिक भावना पर विश्वास रखती है। यह सरकार कोई हिन्दू की सरकार नहीं है, यह सरकार कोई मुसलमान की सरकार नहीं है, यह सरकार कोई क्रिश्चियन या सिख की सरकार नहीं है, यह सरकार संविधान से दिए गए जो आधार है उनमें जो बिन सांप्रदायिकता की भावना उजागार की गई है, उसके आधार पर लोगों का विश्वास ले करके बनी हुई सरकार है और इस सरकार पर हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों का विश्वास है। मैं आशा और विश्वास करता हूं मान्यवर, कि आज विपक्ष जिस ढंग से जा रहा है इसे देश की जनता मुआफ नहीं कर सकती है, जनता तो नहीं हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास मुआफ नहीं कर सकता है कि आज करोड़ों रुपया विपक्ष बर्बाद कर रहा है। आज देखा हमने मान्यवर, ऐसा दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण संसदीय इतिहास हमको नहीं मिलेगा कि इस सैशन में कितनी बार वाक आऊट हुए और कितनी प्रोसीडिंग्ज में उन्होंने हिस्सा लिया और किस आधार पर, यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है मान्यवर, कि आज देश का विपक्ष इस ढंग से चल रहा है।

[The Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

मैं आशा और विश्वास करता हूं कि देश में षड्यंत्र रचा गया है उसके तथ्य सरकार के सामने आए हैं, ठक्कर कमीशन ने कुछ उस पर निर्देश दिया है और उसके साथ एस०आई०टी० की जो रिपोर्ट करने जा रही है उस रिपोर्ट के अन्दर भी मैं समझता हूं कि कुछ तथ्य सरकार के सामने आए है। देश को तोड़ने वाली, देश के नेताओं को खत्म करने वाली जो राष्ट्रीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय ताकतें आज कार्य कर रही हैं, मैं आशा और विश्वास करता हूं कि देश और देश की सरकार इस बात को जिम्मेदारीपूर्वक देखेगी और आगे जा करके ऐसे तत्वों को कड़ी नसीहत करेगी कि कभी भी अपना सिर वे इस देश के फलक पर उठा न सकें।

महोदया, मुझे आपने जो बोलने के लिए समय दिया इसके लिए मैं आपका बहुत-बहुत आभारी हूं।

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Madam, Deputy Chairman I recall with nostalgia my TV interview on the eve of the Bofors Committee. In that interview Mr. Gurupadaswamy was also there. In that interview I told them that they should not boycott the Bofors Committee because it would be better for them to be in the Committee rather than be out of it.

My apprehensions proved correct and Mr. Ram Jethmalani is on record to have said that the opposition should wring their hands in despair why they did not participate in the Bofors Committee. On the same analogy today I feel that by boycotting the proceedings of this meeting the Opposition has not served its own purpose. Nor has it served the country's purpose. It has not even served the purpose of the Parliamentary democracy in the larger context. had they participated in today's debate they would have listened to the views of many speakers here, particularly those of Mr. Bhatia and others who have thrown light on many aspects of this Commission. There was so much to be discussed from within the report that was presented here and the Opposition could also have thrown some light on this report. But they have missed the chance and this chance will not come to them again.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M.M. JACOB): There is no light in them.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: It is the privilege and tradition of this House that once a thing has been discussed it cannot be discussed again.

Having said that I would like to confess that I have not got the full time to read both the volumes in full. But what I have been able to get out of this report is the terms of reference as given on page 431 of the Interim Report clearly stipulated that there were five issues to be decided by the Commission. Out of those five issues the Commission has dealt with three in the Interim Report and two in the Final Report. So if these five issues have been clearly delat with by the Commission, I do not understand what was the need for the Opposition insisting upon the proceedings of the Commission also to be laid on the Table of the house. It was not to be because the terms of reference were clear on the issue.

Mr. Bhatia had very ably dealt with the Commission itself. The Commission, according to him - which he has proved by facts and figures - has exceeded its limits, has exceeded its terms of reference, has exceeded its constitutional propriety, has exceeded the Commissions of Inquiry Act. But I consider it is magnanimous on the part of the Government that in spite of these frailties of the Commission, in spite of the infirmities of the Commission, the Government has accepted the Report of the Commission. That itself shows the magnanimity of the Government. I do feel from what I have seen in the Report just now that the Government could also have been a little magnanimous in taking the opposition leaders into confidence. That would not have mattered much. But anyhow, the boycott of the opposition on that pretext is extraordinarily bad and I condmen it. I think the Opposition has not served its purpose by that.

Having said, this I would like to pose certain question to the hon. Minister. My first question is that the terms of reference of the Commission clearly stipulated that the Commission should advice whether the security arrangements for the Prime Minister were adequate. And if they were not adequate, what steps the Commission should recommend to the government that those should be made adequate. I ask of Mr. Chidambaram - and I charge him for this - that the Interim Report was presented to the Government on 19th November, 1985. If it was presented in 1985, if it contains certains other

recommendations that should be taken note of to safeguard the Prime Minister's life, whosoever may be the Prime Minister, why has the Government slept over these recommendations till the 2nd of October, 1986 when an attempt was made on the life of the Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi at Rajghat? Some Member said that it was a providential escape for the Prime Minister from that attempt on the 2nd October, 1986. If this report had come to them on 19.11.1985 why has the government not taken this into consideration? Why has not the Government taken adequate measures to safeguard the security of the Prime Minister?

My second point is, I have an anecdote in this connection to mention here. Some 30 years ago, I was in Srinagar and I was sitting with a friend of mine who happened to be a shopkeeper dealing in woollen blankets. He particularly dealt in woollen *lohis* that the ordinary people buy. It was a very wintry evening when I sat with him on the dais. he had one *lohi* with him which he had shared with me in order to avoid that cold and as we were just talking about, a police Sub-Inspector came to that shop and there was another person accompanying him. The police Sub-Inspector asked my friend: Is this *lohi* which you are using now your own? "My friend said, "Yes, my own." He asked him "Have you purchased it?" He said, "Yes, I have purchased it for Rs. 12." The Sub-Inspector pointed to the man accompanying him and asked, "Is this the *lohi* that you sold?" He said, "Yes, this is the *lohi* that I sold to the shopkeeper." Then, the Sub-Inspector told my friend, the shopkeeper, "You will have to come to the Police Station." My friend asked him, "Why?" He said "Because you have purchased a stolen property". He had purchased it for Rs. 12. It may be costing Rs. 13 or 14, one rupee here or one rupee there. But he paid a full price for it. But my friend was taken to the police Station and the Police Station made this plea, "You have purchased a stolen property." He had purchased it for Rs. 12 and he had to pay Rs. 200 to the police to save himself. The police insisted that they would challan him. I would like to ask Mr. Chidambaram one simple question: Does he not consider a report of the Government, a confidential report of the Government, a Government porperty. Does he not consider, if this property is being used by someone or being misused by someone, it is analogous to having purchased stolen property? What measures has he got in view to see and bear such a situation? If any Act is already there on the Statute Book which can deal with a situation like that he can come out with it. If it is not there, he must tell us what effective steps he is going to take to see that such things do not take place. It is not a question of today's report. Today, some newspaper has made capital out of a stolen property. It has opened the pandora's box for all times to come. What effective steps would he like to take to avoid such situations?

The third point that I would like to mention is these reports have seen the light of the day only recently. To my mind, the hon. Minister of Cabinet rank also was not privy to this report up till recently, perhaps, when it was decided that it should be placed on the Table of the House. If this is the situation, then it follows that certain recommendations have been made in this report which have been accepted by the Government that in the security and the safety of the Prime Minister, there have been certain lapses. What is, therefore, necessary is that another Commission, consisting of a retired security Director-General should be constituted to go into the details of this report and find out what the loopholes could possibly be and change this Yellow Book, Red Book or Blue Book, that you have for the security of the Prime Minister. This is very important because certain new factors have come up which have now seen light

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]

of the day which necessitate a detailed technical evaluation, and that can only be done by a Commission of retired security officers, of course, with the collaboration of the existing security officers they should evolve a new code so that we are able to see what security steps are to be taken in a situation like this.

Madam, I would end by saying only one thing. I agree 100 per cent with Mr. Bhatia that Mr. Thakkar has exceeded his limits and there is no doubt about it. I do not know Mr. Dhawan personally. But even during the Janata Party Government period, a book was published in the name of Prime Minister's men and the Prime Minister's number one man was R. K. Dhawan. I do not understand by what stretch of imagination, can a person who has been so loyal to the Prime Minister, be accused of conspiring her assassination.

Madam, two issues have been raised. One is the timing. Some Members have stated that even MPs do not keep time. If I want to see Shri Shankaranand Ji, though he is a friend of mine, I have to ask for time and he changes that time twenty times. But that cannot be an alibi that he is conspiring against anybody.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If I do not give you the time, do not say that I am conspiring against you.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Madam Deputy Chairman, instead of giving us the details as to what steps we should take, two-third of this report only deals with Mr. Dhawan. The second point that has been raised is that Mr. Dhawan ordered that the Sikh security personnel, who were 13 in number, should be brought back. Now, I am a small man of the street. If a small man of the street like me can ponder over it and think that immediately after 'Blue Star Operation' somebody comes to me and tells me, well, Mr. Matto, you had so many Sardars around you. Now, this news is current in the market that after the major decisions taken by the then Government, you are taking the Sikh personnel out. What will be my reaction? My reaction would be, please bring those personnel back. It is a fact. That is the correct situation. Supposing this thing goes out that Sikh personnel have been taken out of my security, then, this is another dimension to "Operation Blue Star". So, somebody had rightly advised the then Prime Minister that it is not that all Sikhs cannot possibly be like this and if this thing goes out that all the Sikh security personnel have been taken out, this will be more detrimental than "Operation Blue Star". What harm has Mr. Dhawan done? I cannot understand and this to my mind, is an absurd indictment of Mr. Dhawan by the Thakkar Commission and although I do not know him but when he was a loyal person of the Prime Minister, what more could he gain personally? He was a Special Assistant to the Prime Minister. He was in the Centre of power. What else he could expect? What would he gain by being in the conspiracy? And Mr. Thakkar is pointing his finger of suspicion towards Mr. Dhawan.

If I were in the Government, I would have discarded this report. As I said, it is the magnanimity of this Government that it has accepted it. I would now request the hon. Minister to react to my suggestions as they flow from the report. I would like to know, I would like the country to know, what steps the Government wants to take in this direction. With these observations, I conclude.

उपसभापति: मैं माननीय सदस्यों से यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगी कि 5 नाम और हैं और मंत्री जी का नाम छठा है, तो 6 लोग अभी बोलने वाले हैं इसलिए जरा संक्षेप में अपनी बात को रखें. आप लोग इस सदन में संक्षेप में भी बोलेंगे तो बहुत बड़ी बात है. कृपा करके अपने भाषणों को संक्षेप में रखें. डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डे: उपसभापति जी, आपने जो

निर्देश दिए हैं, मैं पूरी कोशिश करूंगा कि अक्षरशः पालन करूं उनका...

उपसभापतिः उल्लंघन न करें।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेयः उपसभापति जी, प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की 31 अक्टूबर, 1984 को हत्या कर दी गई और भारत की लोकप्रिय प्रधान मंत्री की स्टैनगन से उनके सुरक्षा पहरेदारों ने हत्या की। हत्या की जांच के लिए भारत सरकार ने ठक्कर आयोग का गठन किया और ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट सरकार को पेश कर दी गई। 312 पृष्ठों की यह रिपोर्ट 5 अधयायों में बंटी है- प्रस्तावना, श्रीमती गांधी की हत्या के लिए उत्तरदायी घटनाएं, हत्या में अन्य लोगों की लिप्तता, हत्या में विदेशी संस्थाओं का प्रत्यक्ष या अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से संबंध, निष्कर्ष जिसमें विचार और सिफारिशें शामिल हैं। प्रस्तावना के अंत में आयोग ने अपनी रिपोर्ट को फिलहाल जनहित को मद्देनजर रखकर प्रकाशित न करने का सुझाव सरकार को दिया था परन्तु हमारे विरोधी दल के नेता और कुछ ऐसे लोग जो सरकार में थे, यह किसी से छिपा नहीं है कि किसने लीक आउट किया। जो लोग उस समय माननीय चिदंबरम जी का कार्यभार संभाले हुए थे, उन्होंने रिपोर्ट की कापी तैयार कर अपने पास रख ली होगी और निश्चित रूप से वैसे लोगों को दंडित करने के लिए अगर सरकार कड़े कदम नहीं उठाती है कि जिन लोगों ने कैबिनेट में ओथ ली थी मंत्री की या गोपनीयता की शपथ ली थी, उसको भंग किया है, उनके लिए क्या प्रावधान चिदंबरम जी ने किया है? ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को जिन लोगों ने अखबारों में छपवाकर, सारे देश में नाजायज सनसनी पैदा की और अपोजिशन के लोगों ने उसका निरर्थक लाभ उठाना चाहा, उन पर कड़ी कार्यवाही की मांग करता हूं और जानना चाहता हूं मंत्री महोदय से कि उस संदर्भ में वे कार्यवाही कर रहे हैं?

महोदया, इससे राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के प्रश्न जुड़े हुए हैं। तत्कालीन कानून मंत्री अशोक सेन ने संसद में जांच आयोग का संशोधन विधेयक पेश किया जिसके तहत सरकार को अधिकार मिला कि इस रिपोर्ट को सुरक्षा के कारणों से संसद में न रखें तथाकथित विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह भारत सरकार के तब वित्त मंत्री थे, राजनीतिक मामलों की समिति के सदस्य थे और उस समय के कानून मंत्री अशोक सेन ने बगैर पढ़े ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट को गुप्त रखने का विधेयक कैसे पेश किया? अगर माननीय अशोक सेन ने वास्तव में रिपोर्ट पढ़े बिना विधेयक पेश किया था तो वे किसी भी जिम्मेदार पद पर रहने के काबिल नहीं थे। अगर उन्होंने रिपोर्ट पढ़ी है तो वह संसद में झूठ बोल रहे हैं कि उन्होंने रिपोर्ट नहीं पढ़ी वे उस समय खामोश रहे क्योंकि उन्हें सत्ता से प्यार था। भारत के एक उद्योगपति जो हिन्दी और अंग्रेजी में अखबार निकालते हैं, उन्होंने 14 मार्च 1989 को अखबार के संपादक के नाम से ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट का एक अंश छाप दिया। यह अंश केवल आर० के० धवन के बारे मे था। आज उनका सहारा लेकर सारा विपक्ष सरकार पर पूरी रिपोर्ट न रखने के कारण सदन से चला गया है।

इस प्रकार ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट पेश करने में विरोधी दलों ने संसद और विधान सभाओं में जो घिनौना रोल अदा किया है उससे हम भली भांति परिचित हैं। अपने क्षणिक स्वार्थ के लिए देश की एकता, अखंडता और देश के जो सेंसिटिव मामले हैं जिनसे राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा का भी सम्बन्ध है उनको भंग करने की कोशिश हमारे अपोजिशन लोगों ने की है। हमारे दल में रह कर जो आस्तीन के सांप थे और आज विरोधी दल के लोग सोने के कटोरे में उनको दूध पिला रहे हैं उनको कड़ी से कड़ी सजा दी जानी चाहिए। उनका इरादा क्या है, यह सामने आ गया। सारे देश की जनता जानती है कि उनके इरादो का एक लक्ष्य है कि राजीव गांधी को दोषी करार करो वह दिन भी था जब फेयरफैक्स का मामला इस सदन में आया था और जब हमने बोफोर्स तोप की खरीद पर बहस की थी और आज ठक्कर आयोग पर जब हम बहस कर रहे है तो अपोजिशन के लोग नहीं हैं।

चलेंगे न ए तीर खंजर चलेंगे
ये बाजू मेरे अजमाए हुए हैं।

मैं इस सदन के माध्यम से अपने अपोजिशन के मित्रों को चैलेंज करना चाहता हूं कि जनता की आप बात करते हैं और आज हमारी सरकार के चिदम्बरम जी कह रहे थे। राजीव गांधी राष्ट्र को गरीबी से मुक्त कराने के लिए, बेकारों को काम दिलाने के लिए और औद्योगिक क्षेत्र में, कृषि के क्षेत्र में निरन्तर प्रगति के नये सोपान स्थापित करने के लिए प्रयत्नशील हैं उस समय इस देश की अपोजिशन, इस देश के विरोधी दल इस प्रकार के हैं जिनके पास कोई कार्यक्रम नही हैं, न कोई नीति है, न कोई और सिद्धांत है, वह सनसनी खेज मामले को उभार कर ऐसा कृत कर रहे है जो समाज में

[डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय]

सम्मान की दृष्टि से नहीं देखा जा सकता देश की जनता कह रही है कि विरोधी दलों के पास कोई कार्यक्रम नहीं है, कोई नीति नही है। इनका एक प्वाइंट कार्यक्रम है कि राजीव गांधी को बदनाम करो। बदनाम करने से कोई बदनाम नहीं होता है, सत्कार्य सामने आते ही हैं। राजीव गांधी की लोकतंत्र में आस्था है। उनकी सरकार ने संसद में ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पेश करने का वायदा किया था और संसद में 27 मार्च 1989 को रिपोर्ट पेश कर दी। उसके बाद जो दृश्य उपस्थित हुआ दोनों सदनों में उस पर में चर्चा करके अपने विचारों को व्यक्त करने में कम समय पाने का अधिकार खोना नहीं चाहता। यह बात भी मैं बता देना चाहता हूं कि 1986 में उसी अखबार के मालिक और संपादक जो पूंजीपति थे राजीव गांधी के घर का चक्कर लगाते रहे थे। उनका गुणगान करते नहीं अघाते थे। सभी लोग जानते थे एक टेली फिल्म बनी थी "राजीव इंडिया" जिसको जैक एंडरसन ने बनाया था। इस फिल्म में उसी सेठ ने जो कुछ इन्टरव्यू देते हुए कहा था उसकी एक पंक्ति मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं। "अब मैं चैन से मर सकता हूं क्योंकि अब भारत राजीव गांधी के हाथों में सुरक्षित है। "यह बात गौर करने लायक है। अचानक कल के दोस्त आज के दुश्मन क्यों बन गये हैं। इसका सीधा-सादा जवाब है कि राजीव गांधी अपनी माँ इन्दिरा गांधी के पदचिन्हों पर चलते हुए उनसे भी आगे बढ़ कर देश की गरीब जनता की सेवा करना चाहते हैं और वह इतने लोकप्रिय हुए हैं कि निरस्त्रीकरण सारे विश्व में हो इसे यह जिस रूप में सारे संसार में राजीव गांधी ने पहल कराया है वह कोई नहीं करा सका भारत के जनतंत्र के 40-42 वर्षों के इतिहास में। अमेरिका और रूस को एक जगह बैठा कर संधि कराने वाले काम से राजीव गांधी इतिहास पुरुष बन गये हैं। विरोधी लोग अगर राष्ट्र के प्रति समर्पण रखते हैं, राष्ट्रीयता की भावना रखते हैं तो उनको डिस्टर्ब्ड किया जाए ऐसा काम उन्हें कत्तई नहीं करना चाहिए। भारत की करोड़ों जनता राजीव गांधी को अपने हृदय का हार मानती है। राजीव गाँधी पूंजीपतियों, भ्रष्ट राजनीतिज्ञों के आगे कभी झुकने को तैयार नहीं हैं। हमेशा उनके चेहरे पर मुस्कान बनी रहती है। दूसरा कोई और होता तो मुर्झा जाता। लेकिन खिले हुए कमल के फूल की तरह राजीव गांधी का व्यक्तित्व है क्योंकि उनके व्यक्तित्व में सारे देश की, सारी जनता की दबी हुई, पिछड़ी हुई मानवता का शंखनाद हो रहा है वह ऐसा शंख फूंकने वाला व्यक्ति है जो सारे देश को विश्वास और आस्था देकर अपने राष्ट्र के लिये समर्पित कर चुका है। जब राजीव गांधी की सरकार ने ऐसे गन्दे लोगों को मुंह लगाने से इन्कार कर दिया तो यह लोग कट गये और सत्ता को हथियाने के लिए षडयंत्र करने लगे। चीन में माओ ने एक बार कहा था -"पावर फ्लोज फ्राम द बैरल आफ द गन।" अर्थात सत्ता बन्दूक की नाली से निकलती है। इसका सहारा लेकर और उसका गलत अर्थ लगाकर विपक्ष ने पहले बोफर्स कांड उठाया। उसके बाद फिर फेयर फैक्स का मामला उठाया और अब वे ठक्कर आयोग का सहारा ले रहे हैं। ठक्कर आयोग में विपक्ष ने असली मुद्दा या निशाना आर० के० धवन को बनाया है। इन्दिरा गांधी के दो बेटे हैं। एक राजीव गांधी और दूसरे संजय गांधी थे। मैं इस सदन में यह रिकार्ड कराना चाहता हूं कि उनका तीसरा बेटा आर० के० धवन है। उसका पिछले चार वर्ष तक जिस तरह से ट्रायल कराया गया, 1977 से 1980 तक इन्दिरा जी के दुर्दिनों में जिस तरह से उन्होंने तिनके की तरह नौकरी छोड़ दी, जिसको बड़ा से बड़ा आकर्षण दिया गया उसने ठुकरा दिया इंदिरा जी के साथ रहा उसके प्रति विरोधी पक्ष इस तरह बातें क्यों कर रहा है? मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि विरोधी दल के लोगों की कहीं पर निगाहें, कहीं पर निशाना है जीने दो ज़ालिम, बनाओ न दीवाना, वाले ये लोग क्या करना चाहते हैं, यह बात समक्ष में नहीं आती है। विपक्ष का मकसद राजीव गांधी की सरकार को तहस-नहस करना है। हम चाहें कि सूरज की रोशनी को चादर से ढक दें तो यह नहीं हो सकता है। हजारों-लाखों जुगनू टहलते हैं, लेकिन सूरज की रोशनी का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं। हमारे विरोधी दल के लोग जुगनू हैं और राजीव गांधी सूरज हैं। ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट सदन में पेश हो चुकी है। विपक्ष के लोग किसी न किसी बहाने इस बहस को टालने में विश्वास करते थे। लेकिन जब एटार्नी जनरल की रिपोर्ट आ गई हमारे लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष जी ने उसकी सूचना दी तो आज विपक्ष वाक आउट कर गया। इसका उन्होंने कोई कारण नहीं दिया है। वे इसका राजनैतिक लाभ उठाने में असमर्थ हैं। भारत की जागरूक जनता जानती है कि वे लोग ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं? जब ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट सीक्रेट है और यह सेंसिटिव मामला है राष्ट्रीयता के लिए और जिन लोगों के खिलाफ एक्शन लेना है उसके संबंध मे एस० आई० टी० की रिपोर्ट आ गई है और एस० आई० टी० की रिपोर्ट में आर० के० धवन को निर्दोष साबित किया गया है तो उसके बाद निर्दोषता का पक्का सर्टिफिकेट लेकर धवन आया है और तभी राजीव गांधी ने उनको नियुक्त किया है, तो उनके आने के बाद ये सारे लोग घबड़ा गये है। जिसने यह रिपोर्ट लीक की, वह सबसे बड़ा दोषी है। यह कार्य कौन कर सकता है?

यह कार्य वही कर सकता है जो सत्ता में रहा हो। ये कौन लोग हैं ? ये वही लोग हैं जो राजीव गांधी की सरकार में उच्च मंत्री पदों पर रहे और आज विपक्ष में बैठकर ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट पेश करने की मांग कर रहे हैं। हैरानी की बात है कि अखबारों में ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट लीक करने का इल्जाम जिन लोगों पर लगाया गया है उनमें से आज तक किसी ने भी इस इल्जाम से इंकार नही किया है। ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट में एक शख्स के अनुसार आर० के० धवन पर शक किया गया है और कहा गया है कि उन्होंने एक विदेशी टेलीविजन कम्पनी को श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी का समय साढ़े 8 बजे को बदल कर 8.45 या 9.00 बजे इन्दिरा गांधी को पूछे बिना कर दिया और उसके बाद 31 अक्तूबर, 1984 को इन्दिरा गांधी की हत्या कर दी गई। सुरक्षा कर्मी सुबह साढ़े 7 बजे से ड्यूटी पर थे। थोड़ा समय बदल देने से उसमें कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। धवन उस समय घटना स्थल पर नहीं होते तो दूसरी बात थी, लेकिनें कोई भी आदमी जानबूझ कर अपने को मौत के मुंह में नहीं डालता है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि धवन यदि इन्दिरा गांधी के प्रति और राजीव गांधी के प्रति लायल नहीं है, उनके प्रति उसकी निष्ठा नहीं है तो देश में एक भी व्यक्ति ऐसा नही है जो कांग्रेस के नेता राजीव के प्रति आस्तिक है । जिसने चार वर्ष तक अपनी ट्रायल कराया और इस तरह का ट्रायल हुआ कि अगर कोई दूसरा व्यक्ति होता तो कोलैप्स हो जाता। वह निर्दोष साबित हुआ और सत्ता के दलालों को बेनकाब करने का जो निर्णय राजीव गांधी ने अपने बम्बई की कांग्रेस अधिवेशन में लिया था 28 दिसम्बर, 1985 को अब वही सत्ता के दलाल बेनकाब होने पर डरकर हमारे विपक्ष के लोग जिस तरह से पंचमांगियों के इशारे पर साजिश भरा कार्य कर रहे है, वह सारा देश देख रहा है। सिख सुरक्षा कर्मियों को ड्यूटी पर रखने का निर्देश श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की इच्छानुसार 1984 में श्री धवन ने लिया था। अगर उच्च सुरक्षा अधिकारियों को कोई शंका थी तो 31 अक्तूबर तक प्रधानमंत्री से वे बात कर सकते थे। यह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि प्रधानमंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के तत्कालीन प्रिंसिपल सेक्रेटरी प्रति दिन सुबह 10 बजे से मिलते थे। 'रा' के चीफ श्री काव भी इंदिरा जी से अक्सर मिलते थे। अतः इन लोगों ने इंदिरा जी से जरूर इस बारे में बात की होगी। **(समय की घंटी)**

उपसभापति महोदया आपने घंटी बजा दी है। अब मैं अपोजीशन की स्थिति आपके सामने लाना चाहता हूं। हमारे सदन के एक माननीय सदस्य जोकि जनता पार्टी के महामंत्री हैं, श्री कमल मोरारका आज उन्होंने एक हिन्दी दैनिक में एक इंटरव्यू दिया । उसमें उन्होंने साफ कहा है कि धवन किसी भी स्तर पर इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या के मामले से या उसके लिए रचे गए षडयंत्र से कहीं जुड़े नहीं हो सकते हैं। एक तीसरे दर्जे के जासूसी उपन्यास पढ़ने वाला तक यह जानता है कि हत्या के पीछे कोई मकसद होता है, कोई लाभ जुड़ा होता है। लेकिन इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या से तो श्री धवन को ही सबसे अधिक नुकसान होने वाला था। इंदिरा गांधी के जमाने में आखिर उनसे ज्यादा ताकतवर कोई था भी ? वे तो परिवार के एक सदस्य की तरह हो गए थे। रपट में कहा गया है कि विदेशी टी० वी० टीम का समय बदला गया। लेकिन हत्या करने वाले लोग सुबह साढ़े सात बजे से उस दरवाजे पर तैनात थे जहां से इंदिरा गांधी निकली थी। इससे क्या फर्क पड़ता है कि वे कुछ मिनट पहले निकली या कुछ मिनट बाद ? दूसरी बात कही गई है कि श्री धवन ने अखिल भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान संस्थान से पुछवाया था कि हत्या करने वालों का क्या हुआ। श्री धवन ने घटना के घंटों बाद यह बात पुछवाई थी और यह एक तरह का स्वाभाविक सवाल था। इसमें मुझे कुछ गलत नहीं लगता है।

महोदया, जनता पार्टी का एक महामंत्री जो दो-दो अखबार निकालता है वह यह खुद कह रहा है कि धवन निर्दोष है और दूसरी ओर इस सदन में, मै फिर दौहराना चाहता हूं कि इंदिरा गांधी के हत्यारों की वकालत करने वाला इस सदन में बैठता है और कुछ लोग उसकी अस्मत का सौदाकर इस सदन में उसे ले आते है और यहां बैठाते हैं यह कैसा जनतंत्र चल रहा है ? हमारी समझ में यह बात नहीं आती है।

महोदया, ठक्कर आयोग के प्रतिवेदन में लिखा गया है कि इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या में किसी विदेशी एजेंसी का हाथ होने की संभावना है। आज की त्रासदी यह है कि इंदिराजी ने जीवनकाल में जिन लोगों ने उन पर प्रहार किए थे, उनकी कटु आलोचना की थी वे ही लोग उनकी हत्या के बाद के घटनाक्रम से राजनैतिक लाभ उठाना चाहते हैं ताकि उनके क्षुद्र स्वार्थ सिद्ध हो सकें। हम सरकार से यह जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या इंदिराजी की हत्या की जांच से यह पता चला है कि उसमें जनरल जिया जैसे व्यक्तियों और उनके शासन को समर्थन देने वालों का हाथ था या नहीं ? यह एक विडंबना है कि विपक्ष में श्री बीजू पटनायक और जार्ज फर्नान्डीज जैसे लोग आज इंदिरा जी की हत्या के बारे में बहुत दुख

[डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय]

प्रकट कर रहे हैं। यह उल्लेखनीय है कि श्री बीजू पटनायक और जार्ज फर्नान्डीज मार्च 1984 में सैनिक तानाशाह जिया उल हक के मेहमान बन कर पाकिस्तान गए थे। ये वे वही व्यक्ति हैं जिन्होंने पाकिस्तान की यात्रा के दौरान जिया उल हक द्वारा भारत में आतंकवादियों और अलगाववादियों को मदद दिए जाने के बारे में एक शब्द भी नहीं कहा। इसके बजाय उन्होंने जनरल जिया की तारीफ के पुल बांधे उन्होंने यहां तक कहा कि हमें जनरल जिया से अनाक्रमण संधि करनी चाहिये। वे यह बात पूरी तरह से जानते है कि जिया ने अपने देश के लोकतंत्र पर और जन प्रतिनिधित्व कानून पर कुठाराघात किया है। इन व्यक्तियों द्वारा जिया की भूरि-भूरि प्रशंसा किये जाने से यह सिद्ध होता है कि वे देश में हिंसा और अराजकता फैलाने के षड्यंत्र में शामिल हो सकते थे।

केहर सिंह को फांसी पर चढ़ाये जाने के बाद की कुछ प्रतिक्रियायें मैं आपके सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूं। केहर सिंह की याचिका को अंतिम रूप से अस्वीकार कर दिए जाने पर राम जेठमलानी ने कहा कि केहर सिंह को नहीं बल्कि न्याय को फांसी पर चढ़ाया जा रहा है। उनके अधिवक्ता राम कृष्ण हेगड़े ने कहा कि यह राजनैतिक हत्या है। जार्ज फर्नांडीज ने कहा कि केहर सिंह की मौत के लिए वे लोग भी दोषी हैं जिन्होंने उनकी फांसी का विरोध नहीं किया। जहां तक अकाली दल का संबंध है, जनरल अरोड़ा ने कहा कि केहर सिंह का फांसी पर चढ़ाया जाना देश के माथे पर कलंक है। श्री बरनाला ने कहा कि केहर सिंह को फांसी पर चढ़ाया जाने से सिखों की भावनाओं को और आघात लगेगा। श्री तलवंडी ने कहा कि यदि नरमी का रुख अपनाया जाता तो सिखों के साथ सद्भाव स्थापित करने के लिए प्रधानमंत्री का मार्ग प्रशस्त हो सकता था।

7.00 P.M.

जहां तक विशिष्ट व्यक्तियों का संबंध है, शांति भूषण ने कहा कि वे न्यायालय के निष्कर्ष से निराश हो गए हैं। आई०के० गुजराल, यशवन्त सिन्हा, ए०जी० नूरानी, राजिन्दर सच्चर, कुलदीप नैयर और रजनी कोठारी ने एक संयुक्त वक्तव्य में केहर सिंह की फांसी की सजा रद्द करने में राष्ट्रपति की विफलता की कटु आलोचना की। आज हमारा राष्ट्र जिन संकटों से गुजर रहा है एक ओर राजीव गांधी करोड़ों बेकार नवयुवकों को काम देना चाहते हैं, करोड़ों गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे जिन्दा रहने वाले लोगों को मकान देना चाहते हैं, कपड़ा देना चाहते हैं, खाना देना चाहते हैं। साथ ही साथ राजीव गांधी यह भी चाहते हैं कि 21वीं सदी में आने वाले वर्षों में भारत दुनियां की सब से बड़ी ताकत के रूप में उभरे और दूसरी ओर हमारे विरोधी दल के लोग हैं जिनका न कोई सिद्धान्त है जिनकी राष्ट्रीयता संदिग्ध है, इन्दिरा जी देवी का अवतार थी जिसने इस धरती पर जन्म लिया था-

यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य ग्लानिर्भवति भारत् अभ्युत्थानमधर्मस्य तदात्मानं सृजाम्यहम्।
परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च दुष्कृताम्, धर्म संस्थापनार्थाय संभवामि युगे युगे।।

तुलसीदास के शब्दों में-

जब-जब होहि धरम की हानी, बाढ़हि असुर महा अभिमानी।
तब-तब प्रभु धरि मनुज शरीरा, हरहि विषम भव सज्जन पीरा।।

युगों युगों के बाद इन्दिरा जी जैसी विभूति इस धरती पर आई थी। उनकी हत्या का समर्थन करने वाले लोग आज जब ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में धवन को निर्दोष पाए जाने पर और राजीव गांधी की सरकार में उनके नियुक्त हो जाने पर आज इस तरह घबराए हुए हैं जैसे बिल्ली शेर को देख कर घबराती है। शेर की तरह से राजीव गांधी का सिपहसालार आर०के० धवन, जिस किसी ने भी धोखा दिया है इन्दिरा जी के आत्मज राजीव को, वे उसको छोड़ने वाले नहीं हैं। इसलिए वे लोग घबराए हुए हैं। इसके पीछे राजीव गांधी का तख्ता पलटने की कोशिश थी उस कोशिश को राजीव गांधी और उनके सहयोगियों ने जिस तरह से नाकाम किया है जिस तरह से विरोधी दलों के लोगों की इच्छाओं को धूल-धूसरित किया है आज सारा देश देख रहा है और सारा देश विरोधी दलों के कार्यकलापों पर हंस रहा है। (समय की घंटी) मैं दो मिनट में समाप्त कर रहा हूं। उपसभापति महोदया, विपक्ष का असल उद्देश्य क्या है?

उपसभापति: कृपया आप अपना स्थान ग्रहण कर लीजिये।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं अभी समाप्त कर रहा हूं।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि विपक्ष का उद्देश्य किसी से छिपा नहीं है। पहले ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट का अंश 'लीक' करवाया गया। इन्दिरा जी के कातिलों की सजा कम कराने के लिए हत्यारों की सजा को न्यायिक खून कहने वाले रातों-रात जो इन्दिरा जी के बेटे बन गये थे और कोशिश यह की थी कि इन्दिरा जी के असली बेटे को कटघरे में खड़ा कर दिया जाए, बेटे समान आर०के० धवन को फांसी लगवा दी जाए। जब सरकार ने ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट पेश की है, सब का पर्दाफाश कर दिया है, तब यह मांग आरम्भ हो गई है कि पूरी रिपोर्ट का एनेक्चर पेश किया जाय। पहले आरोप यह था कि राजीव गांधी मां के हत्यारों को संरक्षण दे रहा है, धवन जैसे अपराधियों को बचा रहा है। जब रिपोर्ट पेश हो गई तो अब विपक्ष खास कर के जन मोर्चा के सदस्य कोई ऐसी बात खोज रहे हैं जिसे राजीव गान्धी को इन्दिरा जी के कत्ल में लपेटा जा सके। इन तत्वों का मकसद इन्दिरा जी के असली हत्यारों को सजा दिलवाने का कहीं भी नहीं रहा इनका मकसद राजीव गांधी को पकड़ना, कोई ऐसी बात ढूंढना है जिससे राजीव गांधी का तख्ता पलट जाए उन्हें मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि राजीव गांधी के पीछे इस देश की कोटि-कोटि जनता चट्टान की तरह खड़ी है। राजीव गांधी की आवाज़ पर- करोड़ों सिर कुर्बान होंगे:-

राजीव गांधी क्या हैं:-
चल पड़े जिधर दो डग मग में, चल पड़े कोटि पग उसी ओर।
गड़ गई जिधर भी एक दृष्टि, गड़ गये कोटि दृग उसी ओर।।
जिसके सिर पर निज धरा हाथ,उसके सिर रक्षक कोटि हाथ।
जिस पर निज मस्तक झुका दिया, झुक गये उसी पर कोटि माथ।।

राजीव गांधी करोड़ों लोगों के दिलों की धड़कन हैं और उन्हें इस तरह से बदनाम करने का जो अपोजीशन का दुष्चक्र है उस दुष्चक्र का पर्दाफाश हो चुका है। अब अंत में (समय की घंटी)

उपसभापति: अब अंत हो गया। आपने बहुत अच्छा दोहा पढ़ दिया है। अब दूसरे लोगों को बोलने का मौका दें। आपकी बात हो गई है। अब मैं अहलुवालिया जी को बुला रही हूं। अहलुवालिया जी।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: अंत में अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए....

उपसभापति: रत्नाकर पाण्डेय जी कृपया आप बैठ जाइये। आपने बहुत अच्छा दोहा पढ़ा उसको हम अपने रिकार्ड में याद करेंगे। अब अहलुवालिया जी को बोलने दीजिये। अहलुवालिया जी, आप संक्षेप में बोलिये।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: उपसभापति महोदया, मैं जब भी खड़ा होता हूं, तब आप मुझे घेरे में डाल देती हैं।

उपसभापति: हम सभी पर डाल रहे हैं।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: उपसभापति महोदया, मैं कोट करना चाहता हूं 30 अक्टूबर, 1984 की वह अनंतिम इंदिरा गांधी जी की बात जो उन्होंने भूवनेश्वर में कही थी:

> "Even if I die in the service of the nation, I shall be proud of it. Every drop of my blood, I am sure, will contribute to the growth of this nation and make it strong and dynamic."

उपसभापति महोदया, यह एक महज इत्तिफाक नहीं था कि एक मुल्क की प्रधान मंत्री, गरीबों की मसीहा, नान एलाईनमेंट मूवमेंट की टार्च बेयरर और लोगों का दर्द समझने वाली मां की 31 तारीख को हत्या होगी और उसके पहले उनकी जुबान से ऐसे अल्फाज निकलेंगे। यह एक महज इत्तिफाक नहीं था। वह एक जो आत्मा अंदर है उससे हर अच्छे आदमी को, हर अच्छी आत्मा को अपने अंतिम दिनों का पता लग जाता है, शायद 30 तारीख की सुबह को ऐसा उन्हें भी पता लगा था। जो चक्रांत के घेरे उनके खिलाफ डाले जा रहे थे, जो चक्रांत उनके खिलाफ रचे जा रहे थे, उन्हीं चक्रांतों का शिकार उन्हें 31 तारीख की सुबह को होना पड़ा और अपने ही दो सुरक्षा कर्मियों के हाथों मरना पड़ा वह एक काला दिन था। वह एक काले इतिहास का पन्ना था जो हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास पर लिखा जा रहा था। एक दुबली पतली महिला की आवाज जब गूंजती थी तो सारे विश्व में शेरनी की तरह गूंजती थी। बड़े-बड़े मुल्क उनकी आवाज से थर्रा जाते थे और उनके दुबले पतले शरीर को स्टेंगन की गोलियों ने छलनी कर डाला। इन स्टेनगन

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

की गोलियों का षडयंत्र, अगर में बताऊं तो शायद उन दिनों नहीं रचा गया था, इसका षडयंत्र बहुत दिन पहले, जब 1966 में वे प्रधान मंत्री बनी तो उसी वक्त रच डाला गया था। क्योंकि विश्व की सबसे बड़ी ताकत, सुपर पावर के सामने उन्होंने सरेंडर नहीं किया, कभी भी उन्होंने उनके सामने समर्पण नहीं किया और उनकी आशाओं और सपनों पर पानी फेर दिया। जिस मुल्क को उसके बाप दादाओं ने आजाद कराया था, जिस मुल्क को उनके पिता जवाहर लाल नेहरू, मोती लाल नेहरू और महात्मा गान्धी ने आजाद कराया था उस आजाद मुल्क की प्रधान मंत्री वे जिस वक्त बनी उस वक्त, विश्व के बड़े मुल्कों को जिनको आदत थी कि वह अपने टेरीटरी नहीं बढ़ाएंगे, अपना इलाका नहीं बढ़ाएंगे, पर किसी-किसी मुल्क के प्रधान मंत्री या राष्ट्रपति पर अपना पूरा अधिपत्य जमायेंगे, वे अपना अधिपत्य इंदिरा गांधी जी के ऊपर नहीं जमा सके। 1967 के इलेक्शन में जिस वक्त वे जीतकर आयी, चक्रांत उसी वक्त शुरू हुआ, जिस वक्त एक खास मुल्क, पूंजीपति देश को सबसे बड़ा धक्का पहुंचा, सदमा पहुंचा, उसका फल हमें भुगतना पड़ा कि हमारी कांग्रेस का 1969 में विभाजन हुआ। 1971 में जब इंदिरा गान्धी जी ने फिर चुनाव जीता, बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया, कोयला खदानों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया और राजाओं और जमींदारों के अधिकार छीने तो एक और धक्का इन पूंजीपतियों और इन कैपिटलिस्ट कंट्रीज को पहुंचा। उन्होंने एक और चक्रांत रचा। इलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट की राय आयी, कांस्टीट्यूशनल क्राइसिस इस कंट्री में क्रिएट की गयी और उसके बाद महोदया, यह शेरनी जिसने कसम उठा रखी थी कि हर भूखे को अन्न देंगी, जिसने कसम उठा रखी थी कि हर नंगे को कपड़े देंगी, हर बिना छत वाले को घर देंगी, जब उसने इन चीजों को मद्दे नजर रखते हुए कांस्टीट्यूशन में 42वां अमेंडमेंट किया। और जिसका इंटरप्रेटेशन यूं होता है-

> "The expression 'socialist' was intentionally introduced in the Preamble by the Constitution (Forty-second) Amendment Act, 1976. The principle aim of a socialist State is to eliminate the inequalities in income and status and standard of life the basic framework of socialism is to provide a decent standard of life to the working people and especially provide security from the cradle to the grave. This, amongst others, on the economic side, envisages economic equality and equitable distribution of income. This is the blend of Marxism and Gandhian philosophy leading heavily towards Gandhian socialism. From a wholly feudal-exploited slave society towards a vibrant, throbbing, socialist welfare society is a long march. But during this journey, to the fulfilment of the goal, every State action, wherever taken, must be directed and must be so intrepreted as to take the society one step towards the goal."

धक्का पहुंचा था उस दिन एक बार फिर कैपिटलिस्ट कंट्रीज को, हमारे मुल्क के पूंजीपतियों को, हमारे मुल्क के काला-बाजारियों को, शोषणकर्ताओं को कि क्या हो जाएगा इस मुल्क में, अगर सारा कुछ लोगों को मिल जाता और वह मसीहा गरीबों की बन गई, तो हमारा आधिपत्य जनता पर से खत्म हो जाएगा।

उन्होंने उस वक्त इस गरीबों की मसीहा को इलैक्शन में हराने की बात सोची और 1977 में काले धन एवं काले कारनामें करके इन्होंने राजसत्ता संभाली, जो अढ़ाई साल के अंदर चली गई और 1980 में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता ने आधी रोटी खाएंगे इन्दिरा को लाएंगे" कहकर जब फिर उसको प्रधान मंत्री बना कर बिठा दिया, तब इन्होंने फैसला लिया कि इस नेत्री को ना हम कंस्टीट्यूशनली हरा सकते हैं और न डेमोक्रेटिकली हरा सकते हैं, अब एक ही रास्ता है कि अब हम इसको फिजिकली हटा दें और यह इन्होंने चक्रांत रचा और तरह-तरह के प्राबलम्स शुरू हुए, जिसका उल्लेख ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में आता है।

खालिस्तान का जन्म—मैं इस सदन में पहले भी कह चुका हूं कि खालिस्तान को जन्म अगर लेना होता, जो हिंदुस्तान की धरती में लेता, खालिस्तान को अगर अपना पासपोर्ट छापना होता, तो अमृतसर में छपता, जहां सब से बड़ी प्रेसेज़ हैं, जहां भगवद्गीता छपती है, जहां कुरान शरीफ छपते हैं, जहां गुरुग्रंथ साहब छापने की मशीनें हैं, वहां क्या खालिस्तान का पासपोर्ट नहीं छप सकता था। खालिस्तान की करेंसी, नोट नहीं छप सकते थे? बखूबी छप सकते थे, पर उन्हें पंजाब के लोगों का समर्थन नहीं था और एक विदेशी धरती में, अमरीका और केनेडा में

बैठ कर खालिस्तान के पासपोर्ट छापे गये और खालिस्तान के करेंसी नोट छापे गये और जिसका प्रचार किया गया। भारत को तोड़ने के लिये चक्रान्त रचा गया।

महोदया, जिस चीज को नजरअंदाज किया गया है इस ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट में, मैं उस तरफ आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। मुझे आप बतायें जब इंडियन एयरलाईंस का जहाज हाईजैक हुआ श्रीनगर से और पाकिस्तान गया, लाहौर एयरपोर्ट पर पाकिस्तानी आफिशल्स ने उन हाईजैकर्स को रिवाल्वर दिये। उसके खिलाफ या किया और आज भी वह हाईजैकर जो पाकिस्तान की जेलों में बैठे हैं या वहां के फाईव-स्टार होटलों में रहते हैं, उसका क्या प्रमाण है? आज तक उन्हें कोई सजा नहीं दिलायी गई क्योंकि वह चक्रांत वहीं बैठ कर रचा गया था।

महोदया, यह वो विदेशी ताकतें हैं जिन्होंने हमारे मुल्क को कमजोर करने के लिए हर कदम उठाया और उन्होंने सब से पहले शिकार बनाया पंजाब को जहां हरित क्रांति हुई है, जहां के लोग पक्के देशभक्त थे, उन्हें इन विदेशियों ने देशद्रोही का नाम दिलवाया और आज उनको षडयंत्र का एक टूल बना कर उन्हें समाज में बदनाम करवाया। आज बड़े-बड़े भाषण देने वाले आते हैं, पंजाब की बात करते हैं। जगजीत सिंह चौहान के उस कंफेशन को मैं कोट करना चाहता हूं, महोदया, जो उन्होंने बी० बी० सी० रेडियो लंदन को इंटरव्यू में दी थी। बी० बी० सी० रेडियो के प्रोग्राम में उन्हें पूछा जाता है :

> Do you actually want to see the downfall of Mrs. Gandhi's Government?

जगजीत सिंह चौहान बड़े फख्र से जवाब देते हैं:

> You will see the Sikh history. Anybody in the history who has touched this holy place was never left alive. And I tell you today, you may not call it a prophecy, but within a few, days you will have the news that Mrs. Gandhi and her family have been beheaded. That is what the Sikhs will do. I tell you, I am sorry to say so, it will definitely hurt you, but it will happen. That is history. I cannot change that history.

महोदया, उस वक्त जगजीत सिंह चौहान कहां थे जब तीन सौ साल पुराने सिख इतिहास को आग लगाई जा रही थी? जिस गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह ने अपने पिता को आदेश दिया कि जनेऊ और तिलक की रक्षा के लिए आप अपनी कुर्बानी दे दो और जो अन्त में हिन्द की चादर कहलावे, जिस गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह ने अपने दो बच्चों को हिन्दू धर्म की रक्षा के लिए दीवारों में चिनवा दिया और अपने दो अन्य बच्चों को जंगे मैदान में शहीद करवा दिया, उस इतिहास को क्या भूल गए थे? उस वक्त कहां था जिस वक्त उस अकाल तख्त पर बैठा भिंडरावाला, इनका सो-काल्ड गाड फादर, मौत के फर्मान इश्यू किया करता था, रोज़ डैथ वारंट इश्यू किया करता था कि आज फलाने की गर्दन उतार दी जायेगी? क्या यही उस गुरु का धर्म है और क्या यही सिख मजहब ने सिखाया है? मैं जहां तक जानता हूं जितना धर्म के बारे में ज्ञान है, मुझे पता है कि "हर जपो हरमंदिर साजया" हरि का नाम जपने के लिए हरमंदिर बनाया गया था। वहां से ब्लैक वारंट इश्यू करने के लिए नहीं बनाया गया था। जिस वक्त भिंडरवाले वहां से लोगों के नाम पर मौत के फर्मान इश्यू किया करते थे उस वक्त जगजीत सिंह चौहान ने कोई इंटरव्यू क्यों नहीं दिया? अब सिख इतिहास के इतने बड़े रक्षक बन कर बता रहे हैं—सिख इतिहास जब जल रहा था, बर्बाद हो रहा था उस वक्त क्यों नहीं रोका? बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि पाकिस्तान के जो डिक्टेटर राष्ट्रपति रहे हैं जो आज दुनिया में नहीं हैं, उनके बहुत अच्छे दोस्त हैं गंगासिंह ढिल्लों और जगजीत सिंह चौहान, सिर्फ यह दोस्त ही नहीं हैं, हर साल जो पाकिस्तान आते थे, इसके साथ-साथ इंदिरा जी की हत्या के 6 महीने पहले हमारे हिन्दुस्तान से भी दो दोस्त वहां गए थे, एक हैं जार्ज फर्नांडीज़ और दूसरे बीजू पटनायक और जिन्होंने पाकिस्तान से वापस आकर हिन्दुस्तान सरकार के सारे आरोपों को मिथ्या साबित करके यह कहा था कि जिया उल हक जैसा अच्छा एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर नहीं हुआ। उप-सभापति महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से मांग करता हूं कि सरकार कोई भी कमी न रखे उन देश-द्रोहियों को सजा देने में या उन देश-द्रोहियों को जिन्होंने इस इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या के षडयंत्र को पूर्ण रूप देने में मदद की है। अगर कुछ हिचक रखी गई, कुछ कमी रखी गई, अगर इन्क्वायरी में कोई कमी रखी गई तो यह इस मुल्क की 80 करोड़ जनता के साथ बेवफाई होगी।

महोदया, बात आती है ठक्कर कमीशन की, दो सवालों पर खड़ा है, उसने उंगली उठाई है धवन पर,

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

आर० के० धवन, हम हिन्दुस्तानी कल्चर में रहते हैं, सारा विश्व जानता है कि सोने को जितना आग में डालो, उतनी चमक आती है और उस चमक से आकर्षित होकर चोर और तस्कर उसको चुरा करके ले जाता है। जब चोरी नहीं कर सकता तो लोगों के सामने फर्मान करता है कि यह सोना नहीं यह पीतल है। और आर० के० धवन ने अपनी अग्नि-परीक्षा 1977 में दी। उसको हर तरह के प्रलोभन दिए गए, लेकिन उसने हर तरह की अग्नि-परीक्षा दी। हर तरह से उसको खरीदने की कोशिश की गयी, लेकिन वह बिका नहीं क्यों कि वह खरा सोना था। जब उन्होंने देखा कि इस सोने को खरीदा नहीं जा सकता, इस सोने में मिलावट नहीं की जा सकती तो इसके बारे में प्रचार करो कि यह सोना नहीं पीतल है और यह पीतल का प्रचार चल रहा है। पर धवन खरा सोना था, खरा सोना है और खरा सोना रहेगा—और ऐसा सोना जिसे तस्कर उठाकर नहीं ले जा सकता, चोर चोरी नहीं कर सकता।

महोदया, दूसरा सवाल उन्होंने उठाया है विदेशी ताकतों का। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं सरकार से कि यह जो रिपोर्ट इतने दिन पहले जमा हो गई थी, इस पर गौर करने के लिए कि कौन-कौन सी विदेशी शक्तियां इसके पीछे हैं, कोई और इन्क्वायरी बैठाई गई है? क्या किसी को यह काम सौंपा गया है कि इसमें गम्भीरता से गौर किया जाय, देखा जाय ? इसके साथ-साथ अंतरिम रिपोर्ट भी नवंबर, 1985 में जमा हो गयी थी। दुर्भाग्य इस बात का है कि उस वक्त जो इंटरनल सिक्योरिटी को देखने वाले मंत्री महोदय थे, उन्होंने क्या कभी कोई मीटिंग ली कि मंत्रियों और खासकर के प्रधानमंत्री की सुरक्षा के लिए कैसे व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए ? ऐसी कोई मीटिंग हुई हो, जिसमें इस बारे में विचार हुआ हो ?

महोदया, हर आदमी को याद होगा कि 2 अक्तूबर को राजघाट पर जब राजीव गांधी की हत्या करने का प्रयास हुआ। मगर उनका भाग्य अच्छा था कि हमला करने वाले की गोली में दम नहीं था, उसके पास एक देशी रिवाल्वर था, एक पाइप-गन थी। हत्यारों ने उसे पूरी कीमत दी थी कि एक विदेशी हथियार ले जाकर तुम राजीव गांधी की हत्या करो। यह तो उसकी जरूरत कुछ ऐसी थी कि उसने अपने पैसे अपनी मां को दे दिए थे, किसी और काम में लग गए थे और देशी कट्टा लेकर वह वहां मारने चला गया। यह तो है—"जाको राखे सांईयां मार सके न कोय"। उस दिन राजीव गांधी को सांई ने ही रखा है, परन्तु जो इण्टरनल सिक्योरिटी के इंचार्ज थे, उन्होंने अपनी तरफ से कोई कोशिश नहीं की थी कि ऐसे लोगों को रोका जा सके या कोई स्क्रीन की जा सके।

महोदया, उसके साथ-साथ फिर विदेशी ताकतों का हाथ आता है। एक दिन पहले ही एक अक्तूबर को सारे पाकिस्तान में हल्ला हो गया था कि राजीव गांधी की हत्या कर दी गई है। यह हल्ला सिर्फ पाकिस्तान में ही नहीं हुआ बल्कि यहां हिंदुस्तान की दलाल स्ट्रीट, बंबई और कलकत्ता में भी शेयरों के दाम गिर गए थे। यह कौनसा चक्रांत है ? यह कौनसी ताकत है, जो हमारा सकून, हमारी शांति, हमारा सुख छीनना चाहती है ? उसे बेनकाब करना होगा और सबसे पहले बेनकाब उसे करना होगा, जिसके हाथ में हर ताकत थी, उसके बावजूद भी कैसे ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट लीक-आऊट हुई ? यह ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट उसके पास थी। वह ठक्कर-कमीशन रिपोर्ट उठाकर ले गया और आज अखबारों में छपवा-छपवा कर तरह-तरह के चक्रांत रच रहा है।

महोदया, यह चक्रांत सामने आएं। इंदिरा जी के मारने के बाद राजीव गांधी प्रधानमंत्री की गद्दी पर बैठे। कुछ लोगों ने सोचा कि पर्दे के पीछे से हम राज चलाएंगे। जब वे बेनकाब हुए तो हमारा घर छोड़कर भागे और अपोजीशन के लीडर बन गए। इन्होंने जो चक्रांत चलाए, उसके प्रमाण सिर्फ यही नहीं हैं, मैं आपको इसके ऊपर और कुछ दिखाना चाहता हूं। महोदया, इन्होंने एक रास्ता नहीं अपनाया, इन्होंने हर तरह के रास्ते अपनाए। सिर्फ 'इंडियन एक्सप्रेस' ही नहीं, इन्होंने 'एस्ट्रोलोजिकल' मेगजीन को भी पोल्यूट किया। और मैं आपको प्रमाणस्वरूप बताना चाहता हूं नाना एस्ट्रोलोजी, जिसने लिखना शुरू किया—

> "Prospects of Another Important Assassination in India."

इतना ही नहीं इन्होंने राष्ट्रपति के इलैक्शन के टाइम में हैडलाईन दी—

> "President Re-election and Removal of Rajiv Government Prospects."

इतना ही नहीं इन्होंने 1987 के एनुअल नंबर में लिखा—

"Prospects of China Invading India."

महोदया, जब हम सोच रहे थे कि हमारे मुल्क की दोस्ती चाइना से हो जाए उस वक्त ये वहां पर लेख लिख रहे हैं—

"prospect of China Invading India."

इतना ही नहीं, साथ-साथ ये लिखते हैं—

> "Prospects of Foreign Aggression and destabilisation in India. Future Prospects of V.P. Singh of Jan Morcha."

महोदया, कहते हैं इस मुल्क के प्रधान मंत्री बनेंगे। ये ख्वाब इन्हें सिर्फ चार आदमी बैठकर नहीं दिखा रहे हैं बल्कि ऐसी एस्ट्रोलोजिकल मैगजीन के ज्योतिषी और पंडित वहां पर रुद्राभिषेक और महा-मृत्युंजय जाप कराकर इस तरह की किताबें छाप रहे हैं।

महोदया, अपने आपको अर्ध-नारीश्वर कहने वाला जिसे अपने ऊपर इतना विश्वास है कि कहने लगे मुल्क का प्रधान मंत्री बन सकते हैं। ऐसा किसी पंडित ने कहा उनसे उन्होंने साड़ी पहननी शुरू की, एक कान में बाली पहनना शुरू की और आधा श्रृंगार करना शुरू कर दिया। इसके बारे में ये लिखते हैं—

"Future Prospects of N. T. Rama Rao."

और अंत में लिखते हैं—

"Future Prospects of Seven Parties' National Front."

महोदया, 1986 से ये लिखते आ रहे हैं कि सितम्बर में सरकार गिर जाएगी। राजीव गांधी प्रधान मंत्री नहीं रहेगा और नेशनल गवर्नमेंट फार्म होगी। महोदया, यह लिखनेवाला लक्ष्मण दास मदान गृह मंत्रालय का किरानी था। इसके संपर्क गृह मंत्रालय के कुछ लोगों से आज तक हैं। ये इंटेलिजेंस रिपोर्ट पढ़-पढ़कर इस तरह के काले कारनामे करते हैं, सेंशेशनल अखबार छापता है और किताबें लिखता है।

महोदया, यह इस मुल्क का दुर्भाग्य है जहां सिर्फ एक तरफ हत्या का चक्रांत नहीं बल्कि लोगों ने कांग्रेस को भी तोड़ने की कोशिश की। सन् 1969 से इसकी शुरूआत हुई। लोगों ने कोशिश की कांस्टिट्युशनल क्राइसिस खड़ा करके सरकार को गिराने की। उसकी शुरूआत इलाहाबाद हाइकोर्ट की राय से हुई। उसके बाद डेमोक्रेटिकली हरा देने की कोशिश हुई। उसकी शुरूआत 1977 में हुई। जब ये थक गए, हार गए और छवि बिगाड़ नहीं सके तब उसे जान से मार डाला। महोदया, ये 1966 से इंतजार कर रहे थे कि कोई ऐसा मौका मिले कि कोई आदमी उनकी हत्या कर सके। ये 31 अक्तूबर को सफल हुए। इनकी सफलता हमारी असफलता थी। इनकी सफलता हमारे लिए काला इतिहास थी। इनकी सफलता हमारे लिए एक मौत का कारण थी।

महोदया, हमने एक मसीहा खोया है। हमने एक लीडर खोया है। हमने एक प्रधान मंत्री खोया है। हमने अपनी मां खोयी है। आज जब उनका पुत्र राजीव गांधी इस मुल्क को और आगे ले जाने की कोशिश कर रहा है तो उसके पैरों में बेड़ियां डालने के लिए हमारे विपक्ष वाले, कहीं भी नहीं चूकते। इन्होंने हर हथकंडे अपनाए। जब इन्होंने देखा कि मारकर भी इंदिरा गांधी के इतिहास को नहीं पोंछा जा सकता है। इस परिवार के खून को खत्म नहीं किया जा सकता है तब इन्होंने बोफोर्स जैसा दलाली का केस उठाया वह हाथ से चला गया तो उछर कमीशन को लेकर बैठ गए। महोदया, मैं बतलाना चाहता हूं कि जिस वक्त इन्दिरा जी की हत्या का केस चलता था तो कचहरी में ये विरोधी पक्ष के लोग रोज केस सुनने जाया करते थे सुप्रीम कोर्ट और हाईकोर्ट में। वहां मदद करने के लिए उनको कागज जुटाकर दिया करते थे। आज शर्म आनी चाहिए, आज घड़ियाली आंसू बहाकर हमें दिखा रहे हैं कि इन्हें दर्द ज्यादा है, हमें दर्द नहीं है।

महोदया, अफसोस की बात है कि मुल्क का विपक्ष जैसा होना चाहिए वैसा विपक्ष हमारे भारत में नहीं है। वह अपनी हर जिम्मेदारी से दूर बैठा है। वह कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं लेना चाहता। और हमारे मुल्क की 50 प्रतिशत अनपढ़ जनता को भटकाने के लिए झूठ कहता है, वी० पी० सिंह और उनके दलाल कहते हैं कि हम इस खबर को लेकर गांवों में जाएंगे। हिन्दुस्तान का सबसे बड़ा हाऊस, जिसमें इसका विचार, इसका अनुमोदन करना है, जिसमें इस पर डिसकशन करना है, वहां डिस्कस नहीं करके उन अनपढ़ बेचारों को, उन

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया]

गरीब बेचारों को क्यों भड़का रहे हो? क्यों उनको विदेशी षड़यंत्र का एक हिस्सा बना रहे हो?

महोदया, आपके माध्यम से मैं गृह मंत्री जी से गुजारिश करूंगा कि विदेशी ताकतें जो-जो भी हैं, मैं फिर दोहराना चाहता हूं इस बात को कि विदेशी ताकतें जो-जो भी इसमें इन्वाल्व हैं उनको सामने लाने की जरूरत है और उसके लिए अगर जरूरत पड़े तो एक और कमीशन बैठाया जाए और कोई कमी नहीं रखी जाए कि इसके साथ हमारे डिप्लोमेटिक रिलेशंस खराब हो जाएंगे। इससे ज्यादा खराब रिलेशन और क्या हो सकता है कि गरीबों की मसीहा को मार दिया। प्रधान मंत्री को मार दिया और हम उनकी वाह-वाही करते रहे और हम उन्हें मानते रहे और उनके खिलाफ कोई एक्शन न लें? अगर जरूरत पड़े तो हमें इन्टरनेशनल प्लेटफार्म पर यह आवाज उठाने की जरूरत है कि कैसे ये विदेशी ताकतें थर्ड वर्ल्ड कंट्रीज और डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज को खतम करने पर तुली हुई हैं, खास तौर से यह एक अलग तरह की नई गुलामी पैदा करना चाहते हैं।

महोदया, मैं हाउस का बहुत ज्यादा वक्त न लेते हुए आपसे इजाजत चाहूंगा। धन्यवाद।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. It is needless to say that we have to be very precise, because I have got a lot of other Members here. I am sorry, but...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): The controversy over the report of Justice Thakkar Commission of Inquiry on the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi speaks volumes about the desperate obsession of the Opposition for crisis generation unmindful of its impact on our polity and institutions.

During the last two years we have witnessed many determined attempts being made to rake up unseemly controversies with the sole object of discomforting the Government through a systematic campaign of disinformation. Realising that it lacks any credible Failure to spread disaffection and to overthrow a duly elected Government, has not deterred some of the Opposition leaders and their conscience-keepers from persisting in their tirade against the Government. The present controversy erupting from a news item about the contents of the Report is yet another desperate bid to create doubts in and poison the public mind.

There are people whose only mission during the life-time of Mrs. Indira Gandhi was to remove her from the scene—politically or otherwise. On her assassination, things did not move their way and the countrymen rallied behind Shri Rajiv Gandhi to give him unprecedented support to lead the country. So, the intrigue did not end. All mean tactics have since been applied to dislodge him. All that they have succeeded in however, is to allure away some Brutuses within the Congress. When the steam ran out of their murky campaign, they found that it was time to leak the Thakkar Commission's report. On finding that Shri R. K. Dhawan, whom they had tried to blackmail to win support against the Prime Minister, had, in fact, returned to the Cabinet Secretariat as OSD, they started the present game. A crescendo was raised against the Government in the Parliament and various State Legislative Assemblies bringing to a standstill the normal functioning of these institutions : That they would not let the Parliament function is what we repeatedly heard from our hon. Members on the other side. In deference to the Parliamentary system, the Government laid the report on the Table of the House. A misconceived, rather a deliberately misleading plea was then raised that it was not the complete report. Because of your directions, Madam, I would not like to go into what has been said by my friends earlier. But I do want to say that

discussion and have resolved to keep the issue alive.

Now, when we set about to discuss the report, it is imperative to appreciate that the Commission appointed under section 3 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act cannot take upon itself the role of a criminal court. The Thakkar Commission duly recognised and acknowledged it but unfortunately became oblivious to this salutary principle when it proceeded with the inquiry and came to its conclusion that "there are strong indicators and numerous factors which warrant grave suspicion, as regards the complicity and involvement of Shri R. K. Dhawan, the then Special Assistant to the late Prime Minister, in the conspiracy to assassinate the late P. M. and seems to have played a role in facilitating the crime committed by Beant Singh and Satwant Singh."

The Commission accepts that the Report recording its conclusions is not based on an inquiry under section 8B of the Act, which was neither feasible nor practicable. This is what really upsets me. The Commission was the creation of a Statute but it did not adhere to the law under which it was appointed. The rudimentary principles of natural justice were not adhered to and yet a conclusion has been arrived at which is tantamount to a finding of guilt against which there is no appeal irrespective of what damage it would do to the reputation and emotions of Shri R. K. Dhawan whose life-long mission was to serve Indiraji with unflinching sincerity and loyalty. Routine, cryptic jottings in the note book carried by him and consisting of a jumble of words and figures have been construed as intriguing and suspicious to return preposterous findings about his linkages with foreign money, of his disloyalty to Shrimati Indira Gandhi and his spying and snooping on her. Mention of CIA in a shorthand note which he could not decipher fully after a lapse of two years has been construed to infer his links with the CIA. Discussing his profile, the hon. Commission called him "a high voltage power centre", but later questions as to why Shrimati Indira Gandhi would enquire from a petty Special Assistant about the Indians in a foreign delegation that called upon her. These conclusions, Madam, are wholly untenable and cannot stand the test of judicial scrutiny. Circumstantial evidence is acceptable in criminal matters but not as facile, as weak and as improbable as that relied upon by the Commission.

Two factors primarily led the Commission to return the findings that it has. The first one relates to the *redeployment of some Sikh security* personnel after their brief withdrawal from the cordon around the Prime Minister. The answers of Shri Dhawan to the Commission's interrogatories do not reflect any vacillation on his part. It was natural for Shrimati Indira Gandhi to get annoyed over the decision to remove all Sikh personnel from her security. How could she act differently from her father, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was insensed at the suggestion to remove Muslim cooks from his kitchen after the partition riots. Madam, to observe that if Sikh security personnel had been removed and had not been redeployed, the assassination could well have been averted, permit me to say betrays a lack of comprehension about the grave implications on our polity of a decision as that, of a decision to remove all Sikh personnel from the Prime Minister's security . particularly when the brave officers and jawans of that community had participated in "Operation Blue Star". To infer guilt from the redeployment of Sikh security personnel is in no way justified as also a similar inference from any change in the time of the interview to be recorded by some T. V. film company from 8.30 A.M. to 8.45 or even 9 A.M. particularly when the two assassins were on duty from 7 A.M. to 10 A.M. How that change was material has not been explained by the Commission when it drew adverse inference of

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

"machinations and sinister significance having nexus with the assassination".

Madam, having formed that opinion, the Commission has misdirected itself in viewing every minor matter through a faulty telescope. It questions Shri Dhawan's having fallen behind Shrimati Indira Gandhi near the TMC gate. It views with suspicion his failing to go near her to attend to her when she was shot. It refuses to believe that he was looking downwards when the firing started. Everybody in the crowd at the All India Institute of Medical Sciences was inquiring about the assailants and Shri Dhawan's inquiry leads the Commission to infer that he was more concerned about them than the late Prime Minister herself who was lying in a seriously injured condition. Madam, the Commission while appraising the material before it, uses words such as "going by probabilities", "perhaps", and "it appears", etc. but returns an unsubstantiated finding about Shri Dhawan's involvement in the incident. Even his inquiries about the modalities of undergoing a lie detector test have been misinterpreted. That has been Shri Dhawan's forte. He was not afforded an opportunity of hearing. He was simply flooded with interrogatories and asked to reply within a short period of three days. And some of the interrogatories were not really relevant and tended to embarrass and ridicule him more than elicit any information.

Not surprisingly, Madam, the report has been sought to be misused. Two days after the report was laid on the Table of the House, an hon. Member from the Opposition, on a point of personal clarification, asserted that to term him as a supporter of Khalistan was as atrocious as to accuse Shri Dhawan of participating in a conspiracy to assassinate Smt. Indira Gandhi. The next day he files a petition seeking a declaration that one of the accused, hanged for the murder of Smt. Gandhi, be held "not guilty", posthumously. And he impleads the Prime Minister and Shri Dhawan as respondents. Shame, Madam, I thought had some frontiers. What we see today is the propensity on the part of the Opposition to cross all such frontiers. They would cross all such frontiers if they could somehow be assured of snatching power. The issue before them today is not the security of the Prime Minister or the security of the country itself. Their stake today is the Prime-ministership itself and to try and get that, they are back to their game of destabilisation. They are busy again in creating grave doubts and spreading disaffection in the minds of the people about the Government of Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. To angle for the prime-ministership, to intrigue for the prime-ministership, they can play any card, they can simulate any situation and they can stoop fathoms low. The inherent dangers in their approach, they do not realise. They do not realise that wrong means distort the ends. The people of India, fortunately, see through their nefarious games and would not be misled by them.

The Thakkar report may provide enough material to jurists to write erudite commentaries on the scope of the Commissions of Inquiry Act. But the controversy over the report would go down in the history of Parliament as yet another endeavour by the Opposition to stall the working of Parliament, to throw all norms of decency and morality to the winds, to lower the prestige of Parliament for narrow political ends. I only hope that they see the pitfalls in this approach, that they come to Parliament to discharge the responsibilities that the Constitution of India enjoins upon them and make use of the Parliamentary time to discuss important issues before the country, to discuss matters about which the Government is concerned to raise the living standards of the people of this country. I hope and I pray that good sense prevails. It is not this confrontationist attitude, it is not the

tactics which they have been following in Parliament, which would endear them to the people.

It is only a genuine concern for the people which could earn a place for them. Nothing else would. Let that be clear. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra) : Madam, Deputy Chairman, it is with a very heavy heart that I get up to speak today.

I have been witnessing scenes in this House which, as far as I am concerned, are totally horrific and unprecedented, the type of which I could never imagine. And all this over what? That has been made clear by everybody here and I need not go into all those details. I need not even quote the Report here and one does not need to pay any attention to all this. Madam, I reminded of those days a few months back when the HDW submarine issue was raised. The time of this House was taken for a number of days over the purchase of the HDW submarines and the alleged commissions supposed to have been paid to the Government or the Prime Minister through some commission agents and the alleged commission having been paid back to the Congress (I) Party and it was finally found—I said in the House and the Minister also said and then it was made public—that this Government did not get even one submarine. The time of this House, the time of this nation and the time of the people of this country were taken and the people of this country, in the words of Mr. Anand Sharma, were taken for a ride by the Opposition. It was a hijacking that took place and that is exactly what is happening now. It is a sort of hijacking in Parliament on issues which are non-issues, focussing on problems which are not there.

This Government has had the most fantastic record since 1947 and no Government—I say this with great responsibility—has achievements which could match those of this Government. In these five years, we have seen a growth in our industrial sector, we have seen a growth in our agricultural sector and we have a seen a growth in our political influence all over the world. We have seen a situation in which the country has developed in all these five years. We have faced droughts of the most horrific dimensions, awesome dimensions. Not one problem, but many problems we have faced throughout the country. We have done all this and it is this Government of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi which has achieved all these things. Knowing all this, understanding all this, the forces inimical to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, the forces inimical to the Congress (I) Party and—I will go further and say—the forces inimical to this country have got together and it is these forces which are causing all these problems today.

There is no doubt in anybody's mind—at least, I believe, there is no doubt in my mind—that the Report as it is complete. This is the complete Report, the Interim Report and the Final Report. That is all. Now, Mr. Justice Thakkar himself has said that this is the complete Report. The Opposition knows it. Mr. Chidambaram has said and I would like to quote him ; though I cannot quote him verbatim, I will quote him otherwise—that no other Inquiry Commission Report has ever been produced in any House where the entire documentation has been produced. We have seen the other Reports, whether it is the Reports during the Janata regime or the Reports during the various periods of the Congress rule. We have never produced the annexures. It is always the Report only, it is the Report itself. And, Madam, this is the Report. The papers, evidences, annexures, are all secret. What do they hope to achieve? Let me remind you of those days during the Janata regime—this is very very important—and of what happened then. During the Janata regime, our Intelligence agencies were disbanded and

[Shri Vishvjit P. Singh]

they were sent home packing. Why? They were sent home packing because the entire roster of informants who used to gather information was done away with and all those secrets were let out by the Janata Government. All those secrets were let out by the Janata. You will remember that. It has taken us a long time to put all that together. And today they want us to dismember our intelligence agencies once again. And that is the main purpose of this exercise. What is it in those papers which is going to come out? Private communications, privileged communications, between informants and Embassies, between informants and intelligence agencies, between intelligence agencies and Governments, between informants and the Commission, between the citizens of this country and citizens of other countries who had sympathy for this country, who had given evidence before the Commission—that is what they want to bring on record. They want to destroy our credibility, not just in this country, not just in this region, in the whole world. They want to destroy the credibility of India's intelligence agencies and India's government and India's prestige. That is the problem which they are creating for us.

Let me tell you another thing, Madam. And this is very, very important. It was said by Mr. Anand Sharma and it was said by Mr. Ahluwalia. But I would like to reiterate this. This is something very, very important. Those same forces, Madam, which after Mrs. Gandhi dies, when the case was instituted, turned round and accused in the court, they accused the present Prime Minister of being involved in the conspiracy. They accused him. The same, this horrible man, whose name I will not take, I am sorry—he made this clear in the court. He said this repeatedly, and he was supported by those forces which used to be inimical to Mrs. Gandhi and who are inimical to her son. (*Interruptions*)

Madam, I will go further. This is of which the House should be aware. Let me tell you that those very forces, after the assassins of Mrs. Gandhi were awarded their punishment, said : why are you not showing mercy? Let me tell you, Madam, that if mercy had been shown they would have said : see, this is a part of the conspiracy. This is what they would have said. The Prime Minister took a very great step when he said, and I will quote him : She was my mother, and I am her son, but I am also the Prime Minister of this country, which is why I have allowed the legal process to take its course. How long it took? I remember towards the last days the double game that was being played. The leaders were sitting in Delhi and sitting in *dharna* outside the house of the Home Minister, at night, asking for mercy for one of the assassins. And what were the field workers of those parties doing? The field workers of those parties were going round the villages spreading disaffection and saying : this is the man who cannot even hang the assassins of his mother : This is what was happening, these are the kinds of tactics they are using.

Madam, let me go further. This is what has been said. I would like to reiterate, Madam. What was the disclosure which came in the 'Indian Express'? Was it the Thakkar Commission Report? Was it the interim report? What was all this? These were things which were published in the 'Statesman', which were published in 'India Today'. I would like to give the dates, Has somebody put the dates on record?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA : Dates have not been put on record.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH : I would like to put the dates on record.

8.00 P.M.

I hope the hon. Minister knows the dates. 'The Statesman' is dated 9th of

February, 1986. 'India Today' is dated March 31, 1986, and July 7, 1986. Madam, this is 1986. Whatever we are dealing with today in terms of disclosures by that rag belonging to the fourthrate estate were contained in these articles. These articles contained more which has not been picked up by these people. There is more in these disclosures. In 1986, it did not suit the owners of this rag to take up this issue. It did not suit those editors to take up this issue. As was pointed out, those editors, at that point of time, were trying their best to woo the attention of the Prime Minister. Madam, what about the opposition? These persons in the opposition who are today hankering to take up these issues were sitting in our party at that point of time. That is the problem.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): And holding important portfolios.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH : Absolutely, Madam. Now I come to my final point. Madam, it is those people who have gone into the opposition. They have taken over the leadership of the opposition, this bankrupt opposition, which does not even have the capacity to produce a leader of its own and which taken our droppings and makes them their leaders. Madam, I have pointed out these various things. Madam, for me and for Mr. Bhatia and for many of our other friends here it is like a *deja vous*. It is like a repeat performance. I remember those days when we were out of power and when the Congress Party was defeated for the first time. Do you remember, Mr. Bhatia? I would like to remind everybody of the time when Dev Raj Urs was elected, the same Dev Raj Urs who was then made into a big *hawwa* by the opposition who said that he is a great leader who is going to win the elections. Do you remember it? Then they went in for elections? The press was predicting that the Indira Congress was finished and that was the final nail in Indiraji's coffin. We won that election hands down. I remember that. Madam, let me remind the opposition that the game which they are indulging in is already exposed. The time has come, Madam, when they can no longer prevaricate like this, when they can no longer obfuscate like this, when they can no longer spread this disinformation. The U.P. Zila Parishad elections have shown the strength of our party in the heartland. It is only after that this thing has come into the House. It is in Gujarat also. It is in Rajasthan also. It is everywhere. This has been the spark which has led to this so-called dynamite power of the opposition. Let me tell you that the people of this country are not fools. The people of this country are wise. They know what is good for them. This Government has given more money for anti-poverty programmes in these last five years than has been given in the last 20 years. That is the kind of allocation that we have made and we are going to do even more. With each subsequent budget we are going to do even more. Let me tell you that our policy will finally triumph. No matter what kind of things they might try, this is not going to last very long. Let they try to storm the House as long as they like. All that they are trying to do is to destroy the institutions of this country.

But let me warn them that the institutions of this country are far stronger than individuals, are far stronger than this kind of conglomerations with bankrupt ideologies which they are trying to put together. Let me warn them that the two institutions of this country which they are trying to destroy are far stronger than them. The Parliament of India and the Indian National Congress will survive through the will of the people of this nation. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Narayanasamy. Our train is now moving a little faster.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Madam Deputy Chairman, thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Madam, while discussing the Thakkar Commission Report, which opportunity was sought for by the Opposition before this House, I want to submit that when the Opposition was making a hue and cry before this House, our hon. Prime Minister gave a clear call and stated that the Opposition is trying to create an impression in the minds of the people of this country that this Government is hiding something and that particular suspicion should be removed. Therefore, he made a categorical statement that the Thakkar Commission Report will be placed on the Table of this House and also in Lok Sabha. Madam, the Opposition parties have been telling that the full report should be placed on the Table of this House and the other House. And in pursuance of the assurance given by the hon. Prime Minister, the Report has been tabled. After that, Madam, they wanted the full report. The full report is laid on the Table of the House. Madam, I would like to submit that hon. Shri Advani, the leader of the Opposition, conceded that the full report is placed on the Table of the House. Then, Madam, what for the Opposition is walking out of the House? Why are they shying away, why are they, running away from the House instead of discussing the Report threadbare in this House? Madam, who are these Opposition leaders? When Indiraji was telling in this country and also outside that there is danger not only within the country but also from outside the country, that the forces are working for the purpose of destabilising this country, the Opposition people pooh-poohed Indiraji's version. Madam, what Indiraji said has become true. The great leader, the saviour of the poor people of this country, the torch-bearer of the poor people of this country was assassinated brutally. The Opposition leaders who claimed that they are the champions of the masses, who claimed that they are the people who will be leading the country, who said that Indiraji was telling a blatant lie, they have been proved to be false before this nation. And the people of this country have given the Congress power once again.

Madam, I would like to say one small point about the Opposition parties. There is a National Front in this country. What is this National Front, Madam, if you go to Haryana, we can see sons and sons-in-law being given the reins of power by the Chief Minister. If we go to Andhra Pradesh, we can see Andhra-Nareeshwar, a man wearing a saree and a dhoti. Apart from that, what he does, Madam? The person who says that he is a Sanyasi, who is starved of power, the same person has been proved to be corrupt by the judgements of the Hight Court of Andhra Pradesh. He is the Chairperson of the National Front. Madam, another leader who was in exile for 13 years came to power in Tamil Nadu. What is their Party doing? The people of this country know the incidents in the Assembly of Tamil Nadu. A lady Member was being stripped of her saree. Dushyasana of Duryodhana's time removing the saree is what is taking place in Tamil Nadu. You can see these things happening in the opposition-ruled States. And these people claim to be the champions of the masses. Can such people save this country from the crisis? They come and say before this House — this combination of people — that we are concealing the Thakkar Commission Report. We are not concealing it. There are five recommendations made by Justice Thakkar. All the recommendations have been accepted by the Government and acted upon. If they go through the final report and the action taken report, they will understand it. The Government appointed the SIT to go into the question whether Mr. Dhawan's involvement is there or not. The SIT cleared Mr. Dhawan of all suspicions. With regard to the security system, for protecting the Prime Minister and his family, the

suggestions made by Justice Thakkar are being followed. But the opposition leaders go outside and say that crores of rupees are being wasted on the security of the Prime Minister and his family and those leaders come before this House and shed crocodile tears on the murder of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Can the people of this country believe such leaders? In 1986, same thing was published in the 'India Today' and 'The Statesman'. But now, suddenly, in the month of March now, the Goenka Group and Arun Shourie wrote an article just because Mr. Dhawan has come to Prime Minister's office. These opposition leaders tried to win over Shri Dhawan. But they failed in their attempts. And now they are suspecting the bonafides of Shri Dhawan! In 1977, when Indiraji was out of power, when the Janata Party came to power, Mr. Dhawan was humiliated. He was put to tests. The opposition people tried to take him under their hold so as to malign our great leader, Indiraji. Shah Commission was appointed and in the Shah Commission, Indiraji and her family were put to trouble. But Mr. Dhawan stood firmly and solemnly with Indiraji. And they are suspecting his bonafides!

The opposition leaders who claimed that they would like to discuss the Thakkar Commission Report are now shying away. Why are they not facing Parliament? Why are they going to the people? These leaders know full well that the Government, headed by our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, has accepted the recommendations of Justice Thakkar and implemented them. These people have no point to make before this House. For two days they discussed it; for two days they wanted records to be produced. Now, they are fully convinced that the entire report has been laid on the Table of the House. I would like to urge upon the hon. Home Minister to find out who were the persons behind this conspiracy in bringing out a part of the Thakkar Commission Report. The Government should bring it to the notice of the House and also the public to make things clear. There are suspicions raised and there is concrete information given that the person who was in the seat of power, who was enjoying power, who was very close to all these things, leaked out the report. I would like to know whether the Government is aware of it or not. Apart from that, the Janata Dal leaders who are here, and the leader who wanted to become a Sanyasi, said 'The Prime Minister is a security risk'. A person who enjoyed power, enjoyed power right from Uttar Pradesh to Delhi, who had been the Finance Minister, who had been the Defence Minister, of this country, a person who was given due respect by the Congress Party, passes this adverse remark against the Prime Minister. I do not know how such a person can be believed by the leaders of the CPI and the CPI(M). I pose this question to them. They project him as their leader. It is a marriage of convenience. I am not saying this because they have accepted him as their leader. It is a marriage of convenience for the purpose of achieving their aim and goal. I do not know why our Left Front friends are joining with such people who are the betrayers of this country. I wonder how these people can lead the nation.

Madam, why has this issue been raised now? This is an election year. The Congress Party is going to the grassroot level telling the people about the achievements made by the Government. I am proud to say that in the last four years the country has made tremendous progress under the leadership of our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. The people who are below the poverty line have been given benefits which they had never dreamt of in the earlier period. There is industrial development. There is growth in the agricultural sector. The public sector has also started yielding good results after revamping their administration. The entire credit for all these achievements goes to our Prime Minister.

[Shri V. Narayanasamy]

Now, to sidetrack the issue and to divert the attention of the people from the achievements made by the Government, the Opposition, on flimsy grounds, is trying to say that there is something to hide in regard to the report of the Thakkar Commission. I have gone through the report. With due respect to Justice Thakkar, I would say that his findings, his recommendations, are based only on circumstantial matters. If you go through these recommendations, you will find that these are only conjectures and surmises. Even then, the Government did not ignore these recommendations. The Government considered these recommendations and took up follow-up action on them. But the pat has not come from the Opposition for this, for the work done by the Government. On the contrary, the Opposition is hurling accussations against the Government. By walking out from the House the Opposition has been exposed to the people, with a very sinister design to malign the Rajiv Gandhi Government for no fault of his and for no fault on the part of the Congress Government. The people of this country know fully well that the Opposition alliance is only a marriage of convenience and it is not based on any principles.

श्री मुहम्मद अमीन अंसारी (उत्तर प्रदेश): काबिले एहतराम डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिबा, . . .

उपसभापति: आप भी जरा मुखतसिर बोलिएगा।

श्री मुहम्मद अमीन अंसारी: आपके हुकुम का एहतराम करूंगा। मैं मशकूर हूं कि आपने हुकुम फरमाया मुझे अपना मोअक्किफ रखने का।

डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहिबा, मैं ठक्कर कमीशन पर जो साल्वे साहब, भजन लाल जी, मदन भाटिया साहब, आनंद शर्मा जी, भाई रत्नाकर जी, अहलुवालिया जी और इर्शाद बेग साहब की तकरीरों की ताईद करते हुए अपने को उनसे जोड़ता हूं। महोदया जी, ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को वजीरे-आजम ने दोनों सदनों में रखकर आला-हिम्मती का मिसाली-सबूत पेश किया है। मगर यह मोखालिफ पार्टियां और इनके लीडर, जो सी० आई० ए० के आलाकार हैं। साजिश का जाल तैयार करने में अपने होशो-हवास खो बैठे, सदन मे भेड़ियों की तरह गुर्राने लगे। होम मिनिस्टर की तकरीर का कोड़ा लगते ही मांद में घुस गए, हाउस छोड़ गए।

महोदया, वजीरे आज़म राजीव गांधी जी ने आर०के० धवन साहब को कसौटी पर खूब कसा और कसने के बाद अपने निजी स्टाफ में रखा। बस फिर क्या था, मुखालिफ पार्टियों के खेमे में चिंगारी का काम किया। उनको अपने कारनामे के खेमे जलकर खाक होने की दहशत होने लगी। ये मुखालिफ पार्टियों के नेताओं ने 1977 से 79 और उधर फिर चार काल तक इन मुल्क के दुश्मन, चालबाज, मक्कार, खुदगर्ज और एहसान-फरामोश नेताओं ने आर०के० धवन पर अपनी नापाक साज़िश का हर हर्बा इस्तेमाल किया। मगर आर०के० धवन साहब के साबित-कदमी होने से मुखालिफ पार्टियों के नेता हारी हुई फौज बनकर रह गए। महोदया, ये आजकल टसुए बहा रहे थे। हमारे देहात में कहावत है— सूप बोले तो बोले, चलनी बोले जिसके 72 छेद। इसलिए ये भाग निकले। इनमें हिम्मत नहीं है सच्ची बात सुनने की। इनके दिल के अंदर ताकत नहीं है हकीकत का मुकाबला करने की। ये बुज़दिल हैं और बुज़दिल रहेंगे। ये कांग्रेस जैसी आला पार्टी और उसके आला हिम्मत वाले लीडर का कभी बाल बांका नहीं कर सकते। ये चिल्लाते रहेंगे, भेड़ियों की तरह गुर्राते रहेंगे और मांद में घुसते रहेंगे।

महेदया, वक्त आपने कम दिया है, उसका मैं एहतराम करूंगा। फिर भी मैं एक बात कहना चाहूंगा। ये कुछ नेता हैं जिन्होंने कि मोर्चा बना लिया। हम उसको कहते हैं जंग मोर्चा। उस मोर्चे में शुरु में ही जंग लग गया और जंग क्यों लगा है? इसलिए कि वे कांग्रेस में थे और कांग्रेस में अपना ईमान रखा, तलफ़ लिया, शपथ ली, नाक रगड़ी। वे एक सफदरजंग की क्यू में खड़े रहते थे। इंदिरा जी की नज़रे इनायत के मोहताज थे कि इंदिरा जी की नजर एक बार हमारी तरफ उठ जाय, नमस्कार करते इनकी आंख और हाथ थक जाया करते थे। अब वे एक बड़े नेता हैं जिन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री बनने का ख्वाब रातों-रात देख लिया। क्योंकि उनके आका सी०आई०ए० ने इशारा किया कि बच्चू, लंगोट बांधकर मैदान में उतरो। तुम प्रधान मंत्री होने वाले हो। मगर

उनको पता नहीं था कि गद्दार की हैसियत गद्दार की होती है।

महोदया, अगर आप मुझे आधे घंटे का वक्त दें तो मैं पोस्टमार्टम कर दूं अगर उनमें जुर्रत है तो मैं जो कहूं उसके मुकाबले में आकर कहे। ..**(व्यवधान)**..वे दलदल के दल के लीडर हैं। मैं उनका नाम लेना अपनी बेइज्जती समझता हूं। महोदया वे 1969 में गिड़गिड़ाए। अमीन अंसारी और उनके चाचा ने इंदिरा जी से कहा कि इनको चुनाव का टिकट दे दीजिए ताकि ये एम०एल०ए० हो जाएं। इन्होंने वोट मांगा, लोगों ने कहा - राजा है, कुछ नहीं करेगा। मगर कांग्रेस कार्यकर्ताओं ने कहा, ये तिरंगा झंडा है, इंदिरा गांधी लीडर है और यह कांग्रेस का निशान है। ये किसके नाम से जीतकर आए थे? इंदिरा गांधी के नाम से, कांग्रेस के नाम से और हमारे निशान से जीतकर आए थे। आज ये बुरा-भला कहते हैं। तो यह ऐसी बात हुई कि जैसे कही कोई लड़का बद पैदा हो जाए और वह अपने मां-बाप को भूल जाए और किसी दूसरे को अपना मां-बाप मान ले। उस बच्चे को क्या कहते हैं, मैं नहीं जानता। यह हकीकत है उस लीडर बनने वाले की। 1969 कें कांग्रेस से जीता और बराबर कांग्रेस में जीतता रहा। 1977 में पैर डगमगाए, भागने लगे, पर हमने दबोच कर बैठा लिया, कि नहीं कांग्रेस में रहना है। गलती की जो हमने दबोचा उनको। इन्दिरा जी ने उनको 1980 में उत्तर प्रदेश का चीफ मिनिस्टर बनाया, मैं भी उनकी मिनिस्ट्री में रहा। **....(समय की घंटी)....** इस्तीफा दे दिया, इन्दिरा जी से सिफारिश की आकर के हम लोगों ने और फिर इन्दिरा जी, वह दयालु मां, हिन्दुस्तान नहीं दुनियां की अज़ीम रहनुमा रहमदिल इंसान ने फिर कहा कि आओ सेवा करो और राजीव जी ने अपनी मां की कद्रो-मंजिलत करते हुए फिर इनको मौका दिया। राजीव जी के नाम से चमकते रहे और अपनी और दूसरों की आंख चकाचौंध करते रहे। इन्दिरा जी के कत्ल के बारे में उस पार्टी के लोग यह कह रहे थे कि कातिलों को माफ किया जाए और जब फांसी लग गई तो कहने लगे कि मरने के बाद मुकदमा हो। आज उस पार्टी में ऐसे लोग है। है क्या इनको जिन्दा रहने का हक ? हमारे देहात में एक कहावत है- चुल्लु भर पानी में डूबकर मर जाए।

महोदया जी, ये कहत रहे हैं कि हमार तो रोंया-रोंया में कांग्रेस बसत है और हमार खून में कांग्रेस है। हम मरत तो तिरंगा लपेट दिया। कहते-कहते इनकी जीभ थक गई कि हमार लीडर राजीव गांधी, राजीव गांधी, राजीव गांधी। जैसे लोग तस्बीह पढ़ते हैं, तस्बीह पढ़ते रहे राजीव गांधी की। रातों-रात सी०आई०ए० का कोड़ा ऐसा लगा कि इनकी चमड़ी उघड़ गई। अब ऐसे आदमी का नाम लेत अपनी जुबान को खराब नहीं करत चाही। तो ऊ आदमी रहा जौन आज नेता बा। इनको शर्म नहीं मालूम होता। उसमें एक और हैं महोदय जी, एक स्टेट होम मिनिस्टर थे। बड़े मगरुर, बड़े घमण्डी, नाजियों जैसा ज़हन, बद-दिमाग, लोगों से मिलते हुए मालूम हो कि इंसान बदबू कर रह हैं। हां, कोई धनवान जाए तो उसके इत्र में वह डूब जाएं, हो सकता है कि उसकी जेब में कुछ रहा हो। इन्दिरा जी के कत्ल के कमीशन की जब जांच हो रही थी तो यह आदमी स्टेट होम मिनिस्टर था। यह भी किसके नाम से आज कांग्रेस को बुरा-भला कहता है? नेहरु परिवार के नाम से जीता है रायबरेली में। हमसे लोगों ने कहा कि अमीन भाई, कहां से ले आए ऐसे आदमी को जो रंग बेचत रहा। हम कहे, अब काम करी, अच्छा काम करी, इसे जीतावा भाई, इन्दिरा जी के साथ है, सुधर जाई। जो आज कांग्रेस से बाहर है।....**(समय की घंटी)**.... स्टेट होम मिनिस्टर रहे। ठक्कर कमीशन की रिपोर्ट कैसे लीक हुई? मुलज़िम कौन है? मुलज़िम को कटघरे में बंद करो। फांसी के फंदे पर गद्दार को चढ़ाओ, तो इंसाफ है। हम इंसाफ चाहते है, इंसाफ चाहते हैं अपने हाऊस से। तो मैं डर रहा हूं, घंटी आते ही मेरा एकदम गड़बड़ मामला हो जाता है।

महोदया जी, मैं आर.के. धवन साहब को जानता हूं। छोटा सा था जब आर.के. धवन साहब शुरु-शुरू में तीन मूर्ति में आए, उनको देखा, इंदिरा जी के साथ देखा। कोई आदमी अपने परिवार की इतनी खिदमत नहीं कर सकता। बेतहाशा तनख्वाह पाने वाला इतनी वफादारी के साथ, नेक-नीयती के साथ, खुलूस इखलास के साथ, इंसानियत का सबूत देने वाला, आर०के०धवन का बदल नहीं हो सकता। उस पर हम शक करें, यह तो बेहया लोग ही कर सकते हैं क्योंकि धवन जी जैसे ही इन गद्दारों का पर्दा हटाएंगे तो लोगों की आंख से पर्दा हटेगा और घिनौनी शक्लें देखनी पड़ेंगी इनको। इसलिए इन माखालिफों को आग लग गई है, ये घबरा गए हैं कि हम लुट गए, हमारा खेमा लुट गया। हमारी पार्टी लुट गई। इस बात से इनको घबराहट है इसलिए कि कांग्रेस की शक्ल अच्छी बनेगी. पुराने लोग यह विश्वास कर रहे हैं कि धवन साहब के आने से उनकी बातें सुनी जाएंगी

[1श्री मुहम्मद अमीन अंसारी]

महोदया, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। मैं धवन जी के बारे में इतना कहना चाहता हूं:

"चला जाता हूं हंसता खेलता मौजे हवादिस से,
अगर आसानियां हो जिन्दगी दुश्वार हो जाए।"

अपने नेता राजीव गांधी जी के बारे में कहना चाहता हूं कि राजीव गांधी ने हिन्दुस्तान की अजमत व वकार को ऊंचा उठाया है दुनिया के सफ में लाकर हिन्दुस्तान को खड़ा कर दिया है, राजीव जी ने अमन शान्ति के रास्ते पर, इत्तिहाद के रास्ते पर, तरक्की और खुशहाली के रास्ते पर मुल्क को खड़ा किया। मैं अपने उस नेता की शान में एक शेर कह देना चाहता हूं:

"यकीं महकम अमल पैहम, मोहब्बत फातहे आलम,
जिहादे जिन्दगानी में है यही मर्दों की शमशीरें"

मैं अपने नेता राजीव गांधी के बारे में एक घंटा बोलना चाहता था, लेकिन घंटी पर घंटी बज रही है। मैं चाहता था अपने नेता इंदिरा गांधी पर कुछ बोलूं, अपने अज़ीम नेता पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के बारे में बोलूं ताकि विरोधियों के छक्के छूट जाएं। लेकिन वक्त नहीं है, इसलिए मैं अपने नेता के बारे में एक शेर कहकर अपनी बात खत्म करता हूं:

"खुदी को कर बुलंद इतना कि हर तकदीर से पहले
खुदा बन्दे से खुद पूछे बता तेरी रज़ा क्या है?"

उपसभापति: आपने शेर कहा है, मैं हाउस को जब ऐडजार्न करूंगी तो मैं भी आपके शेर का जवाब दूंगी हाउस की गरिमा के लिए। अब हमारी आज की स्पीकर हैं सत्या बहिन। कोई महिला नहीं बोली थीं तो यह शिकायत रहती। इसलिए आप बहुत ही संक्षेप में सब लोगों की बातों को मिलाकर कह दीजिए।

श्रीमती सत्या बहिन (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदया, मैं तो आपकी आज्ञा का हमेशा ही पालन करती हूं आज का विषय बहुत गंभीर और चिन्ता का विषय है। ठक्कर आयोग पर आज हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं। इसका दुख-दर्द हम सब भारतवासियों के दिल में लगा हुआ वह घाव है जो आज कुरेदा जा रहा है।

माननीय, ठक्कर आयोग गठित हुआ था प्रातःस्मरणीय देवी इंदिरा गांधी जी की हत्या के बाद इसकी जांच करने के लिए और ठक्कर आयोग की रिपोर्ट को लेकर विपक्ष के लोग तरह तरह की अफवाहें, तरह तरह के भ्रम फैला रहे हैं। इस विषय में मैं कहना चाहूंगी कि इंदिरा जी की हत्या से कुछ दिन पहले अमरीका में "फारन अफेयर्स" नाम की एक पत्रिका निकलती है। उसमें यह लिखा था कि भारत के अगले प्रधान मंत्री विश्वनाथ प्रताप सिंह होंगे और यह बयान, यह वक्तव्य देने वाला सी.आइ.ए. का डाइरेक्टर रहा था। तो महोदया, यह बहुत गहराई से सोचने की बात है कि आज भारत में तरह तरह की अफवाहें, तरह तरह के भ्रम पैदा करने के लिए जो नई नई खोजें, नई नई कहानियां गढ़ी जा रहा हैं इसकी जड़ कहां है। और आर.के. धवन पर सन् 1984 के बाद अब सन् 1989 में आरोप लगाए जा रहे हैं, पांच वर्ष बाद यह बहुत आश्चर्य की बात है। धवन प्रधान मंत्री के निवास से सन् 84 में ही अलग हो गये थे। उस समय भी विपक्ष के लोग थे तब उन्होंने क्यों नहीं आरोप लगाया। एक खास बात यह है कि जिस संसद ने भारी बहुमत से एक राय कायम की थी कि ठक्कर आयोग की सिफारिश पर रिपोर्ट गोपनीय रखी जाए और जिस सरकारी दस्तावेज पर दोनों सदनों की मोहर लगी थी उसको अखबारों तक जाना बिना संसद की अनुमति के, बिना सरकार की अनुमति के मैं समझती हूं हमारे देश की आन्तरिक सुरक्षा और बाहरी सुरक्षा के लिए खतरे का संकेत है। यह गोपनीयता कैसे भंग हुई इसकी जांच होनी चाहिए। यह कोई मुश्किल काम नहीं है, बहुत आसान काम है। जहां से यह रिपोर्ट आयी, जहां से सब अखबारों में छपी वहां से शुरूआत की जाए कि उनके पास रिपोर्ट कैसे पहुंची, किस उद्देश्य की वजह से पहुंची, उनका आशय क्या है, उनका लक्ष्य क्या है इसका पता लगाया जाना चाहिए। इस प्रकार से गोपनीयता का भंग होना संसद का अपमान है, देश का अपमान है, और सरकार का अपमान है। इस पर कठोरता से कार्रवाई की जानी चाहिए और जो दोषी व्यक्ति हैं मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहती हूं कि उनको कठोर से कठोर सजा दी जानी चाहिए। वह राष्ट्र द्रोही हैं।

जहां तक धवन पर शक का सवाल है धवन तो तपे हुए सोने की तरह है। आज जो लोग राजीव गांधी के ऊपर आरोप लगा रहे हैं वे जब बहुत पहले कांग्रेस में थे तो कहा करते थे कि राजीव गांधी चरित्रवान हैं, बेदाग हैं। उन पर कोई दाग नहीं। हमें इस बात का गर्व है कि राजीव गांधी के ऊपर आज भी कोई दाग नहीं है।

बेइमानों के आरोपों से हमारे चरित्रवान नेता दोषी नहीं हो सकते। जिस प्रकार पूजनीया इन्दिरा जी देश भर में, देश के गरीबों में, देश के मजदूरों में, देश की जनता में लोकप्रिय थीं बल्कि मैं तो यह कहूंगी कि दुनिया के ज्यादा से ज्यादा देशों में लोकप्रिय थीं और गुट निरपेक्ष देशों ने अपना नेता माना था। इसी सन्दर्भ में उसी नकशे कदम पर राजीव गांधी को भी अपना नेता स्वीकार किया। आज मैं घमण्ड के साथ कहती हूं कि राजीव गांधी के चरित्र पर कोई दाग नहीं, कोई धब्बा नहीं। आज भी राजीव गांधी का चरित्र ऊंचा है। उनमें नैतिक बल है और उनमें देश का नेतृत्व करने की क्षमता है। मैं राजीव गांधी के चरित्र की नैतिकता के सम्बन्ध में दो लाइनें सुनाना चाहती हूं:

"राम से मर्यादा मय है,
जीवन है वह भारत के,
बने सहारा बेसहारों के
गांव गांव हर घर के अपने

धीर वीर गंभीर सदा वह
इन्दिरा जी के सपनों जैसा,
नंदन वन का यह बिरवा महका,
भारत के हर आंगन में,
ये सत्य हृदय का है अभिनन्दन,
वह दीन जनों के हैं अवलंबन,
वह शतायु हों, शतायु हों, शतायु हों।"

ताकि जितने षडयंत्रकारी हैं उनका षडयंत्र कामयाब न हो। यह भारत तरक्की के रास्ते पर चले और युगों-युगों तक इसका मस्तक ऊंचा रहे। धन्यवाद।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मेरे भाषण के समय मेरी कविता खो गयी थी वह मिल गयी है। आपकी आज्ञा हो तो मैं उसे पढ़ दूं।

उपसभापति: क्या सत्य बहिन जी की कविता से प्रभावित होकर आप यह कह रहे हैं?

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मेरा भाषण अधूरा रह गया था मैं इस कविता से पूरा करना चाहता हूं।

उपसभापति: आप दो-चार जुमलों में पूरा कर दीजिए।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : उपसभापति महोदया, हमारे सदन के माननीय सदस्य श्री बेकल उत्साही जी जो यहां अब स्वस्थ होकर बैठे हैं उन्होंने आठ पंक्तियों की एक कविता लिखी है, मैं चाहता हूं कि श्री चिदम्बरम जी उस पर ध्यान दें, मैं उसको यहां पर पढ़ रहा हूं क्या थीं इन्दिरा:

"वो एक मां कि निछावर हों जिस पर मातायें,
वो इक बहन थी कि बहनें निसार हो जायें।
वो एक बेटी सभी बेटियों की आशायें,
उसी के नाम सियासत की सारी रचनायें।
उसी के पांव झुके हिन्दू भी मुसलमां भी,
उसी के हाथ रहा देश भर का अरमां भी।
उसी का खून बहाने में किस का हाथ रहा,
बताओ कौन वहां हादिसे में साथ रहा?"

इसके साथ ही मैं दिनकर जी की कविता भी कहना चाहता हूं, वे इसी सदन के सदस्य रहे हैं। चुनाव का समय आ रहा है इसलिये विरोधी लोगों—

"हिलो डुलो मत हृदय रक्त,
अपना मुझको पीने दो,
अचल रहे साम्राज्य शांति का
जियो और जीने दो,
नीतियुक्त प्रस्ताव शांति का,
जहां न आदर पाये,
जहां सत्य कहने वालों का
शीश उतारा जाये,
खंग बल आधार बने,
जहां एकमात्र निर्णय का,
दबे क्रोध से धधक रहा हो,
हृदय जहां जन-जन का,
शांति खोल कर खंग,
क्रांति का जब वर्जन करती है,
तभी जान लो किसी समर
का वह सर्जन करती है।"

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अब—

"यह याचना नहीं रण होगा, जीवन हो या कि मरण होगा"।

चुनाव मैदान में अपोजिशन के लोगों को पता चल जाएगा कि राजीव गांधी में क्या शक्ति है और जनता में

[डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय]

उनका कितना विश्वास है। जनतंत्र के प्रति अविश्वास करने वाले ताश के पत्तों की दीवाल पर खड़े लोगों की पोल खुल जाएगी। इन शब्दों के साथ अपनी स्पीच पूरा करने का आपने मौका दिया, इसके लिए मैं हृदय से कृतज्ञता व्यक्त करता हूं।

कुमारी सईदा खातून (मध्य प्रदेश): मैं भी एक शेर पेश करना चाहती हूं—

"आजाद की रेखा थी बापू के हाथ में,
निर्माण मेरे देश का नेहरू के हाथ में,
इंदिरा ने देश को बनाया और भी महान,
मीना भविष्य है देश का राजीव के हाथ में।"

अगला शेर अपोजिशन पर है—

"उजाड़े हैं गुलिस्तां तुमने जिन हाथों से दीवानो,
अगर तुम चाहते तो उनसे वीराने संवर जाते।"

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, I would request the Minister to reply

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam Deputy Chair-person, I am grateful to the hon. Members for the views expressed by them on the Thakkar Commission report. In a sense I am unhappy that the Opposition is not here to give us the benefit of its views but that is a situation, I believe, they have brought upon themselves. In the last 3 to 4 years they have bent every rule, violated every principle, denigrated every institution. It is hard to conceive that the Opposition will change its ways especially in a year when the Government will go back to the people and seek a mandate based upon its performance over the last five years. Justice Thakkar, as I said in my opening remarks, highlighted lapses in the security system, lapses in the emergency medical care system, lapses in the work and performance of officers holding high office but more than that, I think, Justice Thakkar, if you read his report carefully, hints at the break down or the destruction of a political system by dark forces which we are perhaps not able to comprehend fully. In a day or two, we hope to share information about the larger conspiracy when the SIT will file its report before a competent court. It will still leave some question unanswered. It will still leave hon. Member Mr. Matto's questions unanswered. It will still leave Mr. Narayanasamy's questions unanswered. It will still leave Dr. Ratnakar Pandey's questions unanswered. Perhaps, it is not wise or prudent for me to attempt a complete answer to these questions. But I am sure that the Members of this House as well as the people of this nation are wise and intelligent to glean the truth from the volumes that will be written and spoken on this subject. Madam, even after Justice Thakkar submitted his interim report on the 19th of November 1985, those in charge of the security of the Prime Minister did not learn the correct lessons and that is why we almost had another fateful day on the 2nd of October 1986. In extenuation, I can only plead that I was not in office during that period. Weighty men pretending to be close to the centre of power were in office during that time but like the Bourbons, nothing was learnt from history and we almost paid a very heavy price on the 2nd of October 1986.

Madam, I am asked to say who leaked this report. I can say who did not leak this report. As the Home Minister observed yesterday in the other House, there were only very limited copies of this report and all but one copy were in the hands of the then Minister of State for Internal Security. It was in his personal custody. It remained in his personal custody until by a note which he wrote, I believe, sometime in September 1986, he returned it to the Prime Minister. It is a self-evident that the Prime Minister did not leak this report. I do not think even the worst critics of the Prime Minister will accuse the Prime Minister of having leaked a report, which, by all accounts, is intended to damage the image of the Prime Minister. It will be a sad day when people-perhaps

not on this occasion, perhaps in the future—I do not say this with reference to a particular context—I say this generally, it will be sad day-when people will tear off our Constitution. It is a sad day when people will violate the oath of office. It is a sad day when people will violate the oath of secrecy. It is a sad day when people will bend every rule, every law, every principle, just to occupy positions of power. And if those are the men and women who want to govern this country in the name of law and they will march towards the seats of power by bending every rule, bending every law, violating every oath, tearing up the constitution, I believe, Madam, that the people of this country are intelligent to know these leaders for what they are.

Madam, as I said, the Government has acted with great restraint. We have lived with adventurous journalists; we have lived with backstabbing colleagues; we have survived. Why have we survived? We have survived because we adhered to certain basic principles that have been bequeathed to us by Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Indiraji. We have not shown any anger at anyone. We have not rushed to take action against anyone and I do not think we wish to do any such thing. If during the last three weeks, we have shown the greatest restraint it is because we do not wish to prejudice the larger conspiracy case, the prosecution of which will be launched very shortly. There is a duty to the people of this country to bring to book those who will conspire against the State and conspire to wage a war against the State and conspire to assassinate the Prime Minister. There is a duty to law; there is a duty to the statutes which Parliament has made; and above all, there is a duty to those who are accused of a crime. We cannot forget that duty also. If I speak with great restraint and great reserve, I should not be understood as not willing to share information. I am bound by the law. The duty to the people, the duty to law, and the duty to those who will be accused of a conspiracy restrain me from sharing more information. But I am glad that the hon. Members who have spoken in this debate have understood the gravity of the situation. In fact, they have highlighted the dark forces which are conspiring to destabilise the country. The name of the game is destabilisation. Let us not runaway from that harsh truth. In the nextweeks, in the next months, the game will be played with greater vigour. We have to be on our guard. The people of the country have reposed faith in Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and those who have been elected and placed in this House are on this side of the House. Therefore, the onerous duty is upon us. They can run away; we cannot. They can walk out of this House; we cannot. They can say, "We shall not look into the Thakkar report."; we cannot. They can say, "We do not care for the law."; we cannot say that. They can say, "We do not care if there is a larger conspiracy."; we cannot say that. They can say, "We will violate the oath of office and violate the oath of secrecy."; we cannot do that. We have to function with responsibility, restraint and reserve.

I am grateful to hon. Members for the suggestions which they have made. I am grateful to them for the broad support they have extended to the action that has been taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Thakkar Commission. I have learned from this debate and I assure hon. Members that we will improve upon our performance. We will ensure that there is a foolproof security system for the Prime Minister. And we will ensure that the forces which conspire to destablise the polity and system of this country will never succeed. With that, Madam, I thank hon. Members for participating in this debate.

VELEDICTORY REMARKS ON THE CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chidambaram.